

# ONDCP REAUTHORIZATION: THE NATIONAL YOUTH ANTI-DRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN

---

## HEARING

BEFORE THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE,  
DRUG POLICY AND HUMAN RESOURCES  
OF THE

COMMITTEE ON  
GOVERNMENT REFORM  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

MARCH 27, 2003

**Serial No. 108-17**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Reform



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.gpo.gov/congress/house>  
<http://www.house.gov/reform>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

87-450 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2003

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Internet: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov) Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800  
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

## COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

TOM DAVIS, Virginia, *Chairman*

DAN BURTON, Indiana	HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut	TOM LANTOS, California
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida	MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
JOHN M. McHUGH, New York	EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
JOHN L. MICA, Florida	PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana	CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio	ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
DOUG OSE, California	DENNIS J. KUCINICH, Ohio
RON LEWIS, Kentucky	DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia	JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania	WM. LACY CLAY, Missouri
CHRIS CANNON, Utah	DIANE E. WATSON, California
ADAM H. PUTNAM, Florida	STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
EDWARD L. SCHROCK, Virginia	CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, Maryland
JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., Tennessee	LINDA T. SANCHEZ, California
JOHN SULLIVAN, Oklahoma	C.A. "DUTCH" RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
NATHAN DEAL, Georgia	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan	JIM COOPER, Tennessee
TIM MURPHY, Pennsylvania	CHRIS BELL, Texas
MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio	
JOHN R. CARTER, Texas	BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont
WILLIAM J. JANKLOW, South Dakota	(Independent)
MARSHA BLACKBURN, Tennessee	

PETER SIRH, *Staff Director*  
MELISSA WOJCIAK, *Deputy Staff Director*  
RANDY KAPLAN, *Senior Counsel/Parliamentarian*  
TERESA AUSTIN, *Chief Clerk*  
PHILIP M. SCHILIRO, *Minority Staff Director*

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY AND HUMAN RESOURCES

MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana, *Chairman*

NATHAN DEAL, Georgia	ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
JOHN M. McHUGH, New York	DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
JOHN L. MICA, Florida	WM. LACY CLAY, Missouri
DOUG OSE, California	LINDA T. SANCHEZ, California
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia	C.A. "DUTCH" RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
EDWARD L. SCHROCK, Virginia	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
JOHN R. CARTER, Texas	CHRIS BELL, Texas
MARSHA BLACKBURN, Tennessee	

## EX OFFICIO

TOM DAVIS, Virginia	HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
CHRISTOPHER A. DONESA, <i>Staff Director and Chief Counsel</i>	
ELIZABETH MEYER, <i>Professional Staff Member</i>	
NICOLE GARRETT, <i>Clerk</i>	
JULIAN A. HAYWOOD, <i>Minority Counsel</i>	

## CONTENTS

---

Hearing held on March 27, 2003 .....	Page 1
Statement of:	
Marston, Christopher, Chief of Staff, Office of National Drug Control Policy .....	21
Pasierb, Steve, president, Partnership for a Drug Free America; David McConnaughey, Ogilvy & Mather; and Peggy Conlon, president and chief executive officer, the Ad Council .....	51
Portman, Hon. Rob, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio .....	9
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by:	
Conlon, Peggy, president and chief executive officer, the Ad Council, prepared statement of .....	86
Marston, Christopher, Chief of Staff, Office of National Drug Control Policy, prepared statement of .....	27
McConnaughey, David, Ogilvy & Mather, prepared statement of .....	73
Pasierb, Steve, president, Partnership for a Drug Free America, prepared statement of .....	55
Portman, Hon. Rob, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio, prepared statement of .....	12
Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, a Representative in Congress from the State of Maryland, prepared statement of .....	107
Souder, Hon. Mark E., a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana, prepared statement of .....	4



## ONDCP REAUTHORIZATION: THE NATIONAL YOUTH ANTI-DRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN

---

THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 2003

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY AND  
HUMAN RESOURCES,  
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,  
*Washington, DC.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:06 p.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Mark E. Souder (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Souder, Carter, Cummings, Bell, and Blackburn.

Staff present: Christopher A. Doneso, staff director and chief counsel; John Stanton, congressional fellow; Elizabeth Meyer, professional staff member and counsel; Nicole Garrett, clerk; Julian A. Haywood, minority counsel; Jean Gosa, minority assistant clerk; and Cecelia Morton, minority office manager.

Mr. SOUDER. The subcommittee will come to order. Good afternoon, this is our second hearing on the reauthorization of the Office of National Drug Control Policy and its programs. Today we will focus on the Media Campaign.

The Media Campaign was authorized in 1998, and has since become a highly visible sign of the Federal Government's commitment to preventing drug abuse.

It carries important messages to our kids about the consequences of drugs and reminds parents of the importance of their involvement in keeping kids from drugs.

Advertisements on the consequences of marijuana use, ties between the drug trade and terrorism, and parenting sometimes now are becoming part of the popular culture that they were created to counter.

The Media Campaign is also an integral part of the National Drug Control Strategy, and a key tool in meeting President Bush's aggressive goal of reducing youth drug use by 10 percent over 2 years and by 25 percent over 5 years.

A year into that strategy, we are on track to meet the goals, but to do so will require a continued aggressive effort at drug prevention among children and youth. The Media Campaign is almost solely dedicated to the President's fundamental objective; without it our national prevention efforts would be reduced to the diluted messages of the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program and the independent pro bono advertising efforts of the Partnership for a Drug Free America.

As one who has worked with this issue for several years, I believe it is clear that it will be very difficult to meet the national goal unless we have a robust Media Campaign. I, therefore, strongly support the reauthorization of the Media Campaign.

At the same time, however, the subcommittee has serious and intensive work ahead of our committee to ensure that the program pursues its original goals, that it is accountable, and that it delivers results.

We also must ensure that the ONDCP Director has appropriate flexibility to react quickly and to shape campaign messages, and that past contractor issues will never be permitted to reoccur. Today's hearing gives us an opportunity to examine several key issues prior to consideration of legislation to reauthorize the campaign.

Among these questions are fundamental ones of program structure and management. The campaign originally was created primarily to fund the airing of anti-drug ads created on a pro bono basis by the advertising agency. It has since become far more developed and sophisticated, with the campaign contractor assuming a direct role in ad development and evaluation, as well as overall strategy.

While this approach has had some demonstrable benefits, such as facilitating quick reaction and the coordination of the campaign with administration policy and strategy, the program, in many respects, now significantly differs from the original vision.

The subcommittee will need to consider how best to balance the lessons we have learned from the first years of the Media Campaign with our ongoing goal of controlling unintended growth and complexity in government programs.

We must also consider how best to provide for evaluation of the program and its results. I appreciate the significant efforts that Director Walters has made to improve and streamline evaluation of the Media Campaign, and I hope we can build on them to ensure clear, accurate, and unambiguous measurement of program results.

Reauthorization legislation must also deal with questions relating to past contract irregularities that have already been reviewed in detail in the subcommittee. At a minimum, I would expect to ensure that any future contract irregularity would be grounds for disqualification from participation in the Media Campaign.

Several other issues also await us, and I look forward to working with the subcommittee members, Director Walters, and interested parties to ensure a strong campaign in the coming years.

We have excellent witnesses with us today to review each of these issues. Our first panel is Congressman Rob Portman, who is one of my co-chairs on the Speaker's Task Force on a Drug Free America. There are three of us, along with Congressman Mica. From the inception he has been at the fore of efforts in the House to create and support the Media Campaign.

Our second panel will be Mr. Chris Marston, who is Chief of Staff to Director Walters at the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and is appearing on Director Walter's behalf.

On our third panel, we will hear testimony from Mr. Steve Pasierb, the president of the Partnership for a Drug Free America. From Ogilvy & Mather, we have Mr. David McConaughy, who I would like to thank for adjusting your schedule to be here. We ap-

preciate that very much. From the Ad Council, we will be joined by Ms. Peggy Conlon, the president and CEO.

I wish to thank all of you for coming, and I look forward to the discussion. With that, I yield to our distinguished ranking member, Mr. Cummings.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Mark E. Souder follows:]

Opening Statement  
Chairman Mark Souder

“ONDCP Reauthorization: The National Youth Anti-Drug  
Media Campaign”

Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy  
and Human Resources  
Committee on Government Reform

March 27, 2003

Good afternoon. This is our second hearing on reauthorization of the Office of National Drug Control Policy and its programs, and today we will focus on the Media Campaign.

The Media Campaign was authorized in 1998 and has since become a highly visible sign of the Federal government's commitment to preventing drug abuse. It carries important messages to our kids about the consequences of drugs and reminds parents of the importance of their involvement in keeping kids from drugs. Advertisements on the consequences of marijuana use, ties between the drug trade and terrorism, and parenting sometimes now are becoming part of the popular culture that they were created to counter.

The Media Campaign is also an integral part of the National Drug Control Strategy and a key tool in meeting President Bush's aggressive goal of reducing youth drug use by 10 percent over two years and by 25 percent over five years. A year into that strategy we are on track to meet the goals, but to do so will require a continued aggressive effort at drug prevention among children and youth. The Media Campaign is almost solely dedicated to the President's fundamental objective – without it our national prevention efforts would be reduced to the diluted messages of the Safe and Drug Free Schools program and the independent *pro bono* advertising efforts of the Partnership for a Drug Free America. As one who has worked with this issue for several years, I believe it is clear that it will be



very difficult to meet the national goal unless we have a robust Media Campaign. I therefore strongly support the reauthorization of the Media Campaign.

At the same time, however, the Subcommittee has serious and intensive work ahead of it to ensure that the program pursues its original goals, that it is accountable, and that it delivers results. We also must ensure that the ONDCP Director has appropriate flexibility to react quickly and to shape campaign messages, and that past contractor issues will never be permitted to recur. Today's hearing gives us an opportunity to examine several key issues prior to consideration of legislation to reauthorize the campaign.

Among these questions are fundamental ones of program structure and management. The Campaign originally was created primarily to fund the airing of anti-drug ads created on a *pro bono* basis by the advertising industry. It has since become far more developed and sophisticated, with the Campaign contractor assuming a direct role in ad development and evaluation as well as overall strategy. While this approach has had some demonstrable benefits such as facilitating quick reaction and the coordination of the campaign with Administration policy and strategy, the program in many respects now significantly differs from the original vision. The Subcommittee will need to consider how best to balance the lessons we have learned from the first years of the Media Campaign with our ongoing goal of controlling unintended growth and complexity in government programs.

We must also consider how best to provide for evaluation of the program and its results. I appreciate the significant efforts that Director Walters has made to improve and streamline evaluation of the Media Campaign, and I hope we can build on them to ensure clear, accurate, and unambiguous measurement of program results. Reauthorization legislation must also deal with questions relating to past contract irregularities that have already been reviewed in detail in the Subcommittee. At a minimum, I would expect to ensure that any future contract irregularity would be grounds for disqualification from participation in the Media Campaign. Several other issues also await us, and I look forward to working with the

Subcommittee members, Director Walters, and interested parties to ensure a strong Campaign in the coming years.

We have excellent witnesses with us today to review each of these issues. On our first panel is Congressman Rob Portman, who is one of my co-chairs on the Speaker's Task Force on a Drug Free America and from the inception has been at the fore of efforts in the House to create and support the Media Campaign. Our second panel will be Mr. Chris Marston, who is Chief of Staff to Director Walters at the Office of National Drug Control Policy and is appearing on his behalf. On our third panel, we will hear testimony from Mr. Steve Pasierb, the President of the Partnership for a Drug Free America. From Ogilvy & Mather, we have Mr. David McConnaughey, who I would like to thank for adjusting his plans to be with us today. And from The Ad Council, we will be joined by Ms. Peggy Conlon, the President and CEO. Thank you all for coming, and I look forward to the discussion.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Thank you very, Mr. Chairman, and I thank you for holding this important hearing on one of the Federal Government's most important and visible drug prevention initiatives.

One of two major national prevention programs administered by the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign is the Federal Government's primary vehicle for communicating anti-drug messages to the American public, with the primary focus on discouraging illegal drug use among our youth.

Authorizing jurisdiction for the Office of National Drug Control Policy lies with this subcommittee. In the weeks to come, it will be our job to report out legislation reauthorizing ONDCP, the Media Campaign, and other programs within ONDCP's administrative purview.

In the meantime, we must evaluate the performance of those entities to date, and determine what changes may be in order to help the programs do more effectively the jobs Congress created them to do. Today's hearing is an important part of that process.

From the beginning, the bedrock of the Media Campaign has been television advertising provided to the Government on a pro bono basis by leading U.S. advertising agencies through the coordinating umbrella of the Partnership for a Drug Free America.

It is notable that the advertising industry took it upon itself to begin airing anti-drug ads well before the Government got involved. PDFA was founded in 1986 by industry leaders who had the vision to realize that their industry's talent and expertise could and should be brought to bear against the problem of drug abuse.

Only in 1997 did the industry approach the Clinton administration in Congress for help in purchasing air time to keep the campaign going in the new environment of media deregulation.

Because there was evidence that PDFA's anti-drug ad campaign had been effective in reducing drug usage, Congress appropriated \$195 million for the campaign for fiscal year 1998, and passed legislation authorizing appropriations through fiscal year 2002.

Appropriations for the campaign have gradually declined over the past couple of years, and this year, the program is operating on unauthorized appropriations of \$150 million.

Even as Federal funding has dwindled ONDCP has pursued an ambitious multi-media strategy for the campaign, involving Web sites, print publications, and partnerships with the entertainment industry, community anti-drug coalitions and others, in addition to planning and executing media buys to run donated advertising.

These efforts include creating paid content to extend the campaign's reach to specific minority and foreign language populations.

All of this is commendable. The bottom line challenge that we face in reauthorizing the campaign is deciding how to maximize the campaign's impact in reducing drug usage.

Since assuming the Office of Director of National Drug Control Policy, John Walters, to his credit, has restored the campaign's original focus on emphasizing the risk of drug use and targeting older teens.

Director Walters and ONDCP also deserve credit for improving coordination and communication with PDFA, and increasing attention to ad testing.

Despite the negative press attention that it has received of late, the campaign has produced positive results, but we all believe it can do better.

Looking to the campaign's future, preserving the heart of the campaign by making the most of the expertise of the volunteering advertising agencies involved in creating pro bono content for the campaign, that must be a high priority.

Other priorities should include ensuring the testing of ads and making sure we have an evaluation component that enables us to measure results in a timely and cost-efficient manner.

Another important issue, Mr. Chairman, is fiscal accountability and contract management. The concept of Federal support for anti-drug media messaging is hard to find a fault with. But public support for this campaign can only be maintained with assurances that the well publicized contract mismanagement problems of the recent past will not occur again.

We will hear today from most of the major parties with direct involvement in the campaign. And I want to extend my warm welcome to all of them.

Last, but certainly not least, I want to welcome our House colleague, Rob Portman of Ohio, who will testify on the first panel. As you know, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Portman worked very closely with us in reauthorizing the Drug Free Communities Program in the 107th Congress.

I am happy to be working with him again, and with Mr. Biden and Mr. Hatch in the other body, to develop a bill that addresses some of the critical areas in which improvements to the Media Campaign can be made.

It is our hope that the bill, when introduced, will serve as a useful point of reference for the subcommittee, as it considers Media Campaign language for inclusion in the ONDCP reauthorization bill that will move through this subcommittee in the coming months.

With that said, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with you, our fellow members of the Drug Policy Subcommittee, our counterparts in the Senate, Director Walters and ONDCP staff, and all of the groups represented here today, in a cooperative effort to make the campaign as effective and cost efficient and as accountable as it can be.

I thank you again for holding the hearing, and I look forward to hearing the testimony of our witnesses.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you, Mr. Cummings.

We are joined by our distinguished colleague from Texas, Mr. Carter, and also Mr. Bell. Do you have any opening statements?

[No response.]

Mr. SOUDER. Let me say for the record and for the other members of the committee, in 2 weeks, we will be having a hearing on the HIDAs, which is another key part of the reauthorization. Our intention is to move ahead with the mark-up in subcommittee, right after break, after the April recess, basically that last week/first week of May, and then move to full committee, and we have been meeting with the Senate.

But as Members have input on any of those particulars or for the hearings, I know in the legislation, we are doing all this simulta-

neously, so we can try to move the House version early on in the year and hopefully have it pretty synchronized with the Senate, as we move forth.

I would like to ask unanimous content that all Members have 5 legislative days to submit written statements and questions for the hearing record, and that any answers to written questions provided by the witnesses also be included in the record. Without objection, it is so ordered.

I also ask unanimous consent that all exhibits, documents, and other materials referred to by Members and the witnesses may be included in the hearing record, and that all Members be permitted to revise and extend their remarks. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Our first panel is our colleague, Congressman Rob Portman. By tradition, we do not administer an oath to Members of Congress, so you are recognized for 5 minutes. If you come forth and your ears are burning, we all said nice things about you in our opening statements, but you missed that.

But we still feel those, and know that the record is littered with praise to Rob Portman for your leadership in the prevention efforts, both by the ranking member and myself. It is a great honor to have you here today to lead off our hearing on this particular aspect of the reauthorization.

**STATEMENT OF HON. ROB PORTMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO**

Mr. PORTMAN. Thank you very much for having me this afternoon to speak a little about a very important part of our overall efforts to reduce demand.

Judge Carter, it is good to see you. Mr. Cummings, my colleague and co-sponsor of these important pieces of legislation on this issue, thank you for your many efforts back home in Baltimore and here in Washington to try to keep our kids safe and drug free. Mr. Bell, welcome to the subcommittee. I am sure it has been an interesting experience.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for your leadership and for allowing me to testify on the reauthorization of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. The subcommittee has been great to work with.

It is always good for me to come back to this committee. I used to be a member of the Government Reform Committee, and I have great respect for your work and your jurisdiction over this issue that you have certainly taken very seriously.

By recognizing the importance of the Media Campaign and an effective Media Campaign, you are signaling to our whole country that this Congress will not cede the health, safety, and lives of our children to the dangers of illegal drugs.

We all want to prevent our children from using drugs. We all know there is no single magic bullet or solution that is going to accomplish this goal. But we also recognize, I think, as a group, that one important way to do so is to use the popular media.

As you all are well aware, the Partnership for a DrugFree America, and I see some of the representatives here today, operated a successful Media Campaign long before we got involved.

The Federal Government got involved when Congress understood the importance of the anti-drug media message and wanted to ensure that it would continue at a time when, frankly, for a variety of reasons, it appeared there would be a serious drop-off in public service advertising, particularly doing prime time with regard to the TV advertising.

Congressional involvement began in 1998, with the idea of using Federal dollars, but on a matching basis to purchase media time to air anti-drug ads created by the best and brightest in the advertising world on a pro bono basis.

The Partnership ensures that the creative and production elements of the process, the actual developments of the ads, are secured on a pro bono basis, which has been very important to us over the last several years. So we are receiving for free really what the corporate America community pays thousands and even millions of dollars for.

Only the actual advertising time itself is purchased with these Federal tax dollars and, again, that is matched. Even though that is expensive, I believe the taxpayers get a strong return on the investment, as every dollar spent is matched.

Since 1998, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, ONDCP, has run the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. With the help of their private sector partners, including the Partnership, the campaign has now created well over 200 commercials.

Some have said the campaign has lost its way. While the outcomes from the latest wave of data could have been better, not all the news is bad.

We are seeing extremely positive outcomes with parents, for instance, which I think, all of us agree is extremely important. I believe it is the single most important thing, that we get our parents more engaged in our kids' lives, and talking to their kids about drugs.

The Media Campaign has helped to make parents realize that they do play a vital role in preventing their children from using drugs.

Unfortunately, we are not seeing a meaningful decrease in the most important number and that is the percentage of teenagers who are using illegal drugs.

That being said, I remain convinced, Mr. Chairman, that the Media Campaign can be effective. I say this because of the proven ability of public service campaigns to change attitudes; when you change attitudes, you change behavior. We know it works.

But I also see it firsthand in my own community. We have had a very aggressive anti-drug Media Campaign in Cincinnati, OH. We have gotten over \$1 million a year in free advertising, and it has made a big difference.

We know that because the Coalition for a Drug Free Greater Cincinnati, which I founded and served as chairman, has conducted a very comprehensive research-based survey, which showed a decline in teen drug use in our region for the first time in 12 years.

Over the past 2 years, marijuana use by teens is down 13 percent; alcohol use is down 24 percent; and cigarette use by teenagers is down 28 percent. The Coalition helps run this extensive local Media Campaign through TV, radio, and print.

In fact, the local media in our area, again, has generously donated over \$1 million in local anti-drug ads, on an annual basis, for the last 3 years. The survey data also tells us the Media Campaign is specifically involved in bringing these numbers down.

Based on our survey, kids who have seen anti-drug ads on a regular basis are 20 percent less likely to use drugs. We surveyed, by the way, 67,000 local students from 123 high school. This is a huge sample. It almost makes it more like a census than a survey. Based on the experts, they believe these results, therefore, are extremely accurate.

The results I have mentioned indicate to me that prevention and education tools like the Media Campaign are working, and we need to keep the effort going with effective media.

Mr. Chairman, many ideas have been suggested to improve the campaign. As you know, I have been working with you and with Congressman Cummings, your ranking member, and also Senators Hatch and Biden, to draft legislation that would strengthen and improve the Media Campaign.

We agreed that the Director of ONDCP must be granted the flexibility to chart the general course of the campaign and he should have the final say over the ads, because I think that is where the accountability rests, ultimately. We also believe the actual creation and production of the ads should be left to the experts, and on a pro bono basis.

For efficiency and effectiveness sake, our bill seeks to delineate the functions carried out by the Drug Czar, who is Director of the ONDCP; the Partnership for a Drug Free America; and the contractor hired to purchase the actual advertising time.

We also need to ensure that the greatest possible amount of funds that Congress appropriates to the campaign are used to purchase these ads: radio, TV, and print ads.

Our bill will also put provisions in place to ensure that any remaining vestiges of fraud and abuse have been eliminated.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we need to better test the outcomes of these campaigns. We need to be sure that we have a clear understanding of the campaign's actual effects on teenagers and on their parents.

Again, thanks for having me here today. I am very hopeful and confident that this and other hearings will give us the needed guidance to be able to draft a better reauthorization bill that will result in a more effective campaign.

But I must say, again, now is not the time to let our guard down. I think it is a very crucial time, actually, for us to do all we can on the prevention time to decrease demand for drugs in this country. I look forward to working with you, Mr. Chairman, and the subcommittee on this very important project.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Rob Portman follows:]

**Statement of The Honorable Rob Portman  
Before the  
House Government Reform Subcommittee on Criminal Justice,  
Drug Policy and Human Resources  
March 27, 2003**

Chairman Souder, Ranking Member Cummings and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for allowing me to testify today on the reauthorization of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. I have enjoyed working with the Subcommittee in the past and look forward to tackling this issue together. And, as a former member of the Government Reform Committee it is always nice to be back.

First, I want to thank you for holding this hearing. By recognizing the importance of an effective media campaign you are signaling to the country that Congress will not cede the health, safety and lives of our children to the dangers of illegal drugs.

We all want to prevent our young people from using drugs. We all know that there is no one single magic bullet or solution that will accomplish this goal. But we also recognize that one important way to get that message across is through the popular media.

As you are well aware, the Partnership for a Drug-Free America operated a successful media campaign long before the federal government became involved. Congress understood the importance of the anti-drug media message and wanted to ensure that it would continue at a time when for a variety of reasons there was a drop off in public service advertising, especially during prime time.

Congressional involvement began in 1998 with the idea of using federal dollars on a matching basis to purchase media time to air anti-drug ads created by the best and brightest in the advertising world. The Partnership ensures that the creative and production elements of the process -- the actual development of the ads -- are secured on a pro bono basis. Thus, the media campaign receives for free what corporate America pay thousands of dollars per ad to receive. Only the actual advertising time itself is purchased. Even though advertising is expensive, taxpayers get a strong return on the investment as every dollar spent on media buys is matched by the private sector.

Since 1998, the Office of National Drug Control Policy has run the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. With the help of private sector partners, including the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, the campaign has created well over 200 commercials.

Some have said the campaign has lost its way. While the outcomes from the latest wave of data could have been better, not all of the news is bad. We saw extremely positive outcomes with parents. More parents are seeing the ads and talking to their kids about drugs as a result. The media campaign has helped to make parents realize that they play a vital role in preventing their kids from using drugs. Unfortunately, we are not seeing a meaningful decrease in the most



important number -- the percentage of teenagers using drugs.

That being said I remain convinced the media campaign can be effective. I say this because of the proven ability of public service campaigns to change attitudes and then behavior. But also because I have seen first-hand in my own community the positive results that can be gained through an effective media campaign.

The Coalition for a Drug-Free Greater Cincinnati, which I founded and serve as Chairman, recently conducted a research-based, comprehensive school survey that showed a decline in teen drug use in our region for the first time in 12 years. Over the past two years, marijuana use by teens is down 13 percent, alcohol use is down 24 percent, and cigarette use is down 28 percent. The Coalition helps run an extensive local media campaign through television, radio and print. In fact, the local media in southwest Ohio have generously donated over \$1 million in anti-drug ads on an annual basis for the last three years. The survey data tells us that the media campaign is helping to bring these numbers down. Based on our survey, kids who have seen anti-drug ads on a regular basis are 20 percent less likely to use drugs.

We surveyed 67,000 local students from 123 Greater Cincinnati schools. This is a huge sample and makes it the largest survey of its kind in the country. The results I just mentioned indicate to me that prevention and education tools like the media campaign work and we need to keep the effort going.

Mr. Chairman, many different ideas have been suggested to improve the campaign. As you know I have been working with Congressman Cummings and Senators Hatch and Biden to draft legislation that would strengthen and improve the media campaign. While we agree that the Director of ONDCP must be granted the flexibility to chart the general course of the campaign and he should have the final say over the ads, we also believe the actual creation and production of the ads should be left to the experts. For efficiency and effectiveness sake, our bill seeks to delineate the functions carried out by the Drug Czar, the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, and the contractor hired to purchase the actual advertising time. We also need to ensure that the greatest possible amount of funds Congress appropriates to the campaign are used to purchase actual radio, television and print ads. Our bill will also put provisions in place to ensure that any remaining vestiges of fraud and abuse have been eliminated. Finally, Mr. Chairman, we need to better test the outcomes of the campaign so we can have a clearer understanding of the campaigns effects on teenagers and their parents.

Mr. Chairman, again, thank you for having me here today. I am hopeful and confident that this and other hearings will give us the guidance needed to draft a reauthorization bill that will result in a more effective media campaign. Now is not the time to let our guard down. I look forward to working with you and the Subcommittee on this important project.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much, not only for your testimony, but your work. We were both relatively upset at some of the statements made around the release of some of the data and the interpretation which indirectly led to the funding being cut in the Appropriations Bill last year.

Could you give your opinion, and I know how we both feel; but for the record, what would have happened, had we not had a Media Campaign, which is part of it; and elaborate on it a little bit on what you said, as far as its effectiveness and the problems we are having with how to measure it.

Because the implication was that the ad campaign was failing, which I do not believe was the case at all. With the crime dropping in the United States, what we had were a couple of categories of questionable effectiveness in its relationship with the ad campaign.

Mr. PORTMAN. I think, again, if you look at the study and not just at the media stories that accompanied them, there was some very positive news in there. That is with regard to parents and changing attitudes.

That, for us, I think, mid-term, and not even long-term, but over the next 2, 3, 4, 5 years, will have more impact than a single element of the campaign. Because, again, I think parents are the single most effective influence in a young person's life.

Mr. RUNG. All the data supports that, by the way. Sometimes as a parent, you may wonder, and I do, but that is the kind of direction that I think these ads can help us to obtain. So I was very impressed with that.

I think some of the other data with regard to the young people was mixed, frankly. I was very disappointed, as you know, by some of the interpretations of some of that data that could have suggested that some young people and, particularly, I think it was girls, might have been influenced to use drugs more on the basis of the Media Campaign.

That was later viewed to be inaccurate and was refuted, I think, in a very definitive way. But I thought that was irresponsible to have that out in the public.

I also think that we can do a better job. You and I have talked about this, to be sure that these ads are all tested, to be sure that we are putting the very best up on the air, to be sure that we are focusing on where we view the problems, because they will change over time. That is in terms of drug use and in terms of attitudes.

I also think, as you state, that there are so many external factors regarding drug use, including popular culture, and you mentioned crime, and other factors, that it is very difficult to pin the credit or the blame on one element or another, for our prevention efforts.

But to me, it would be foolhardy for us to pull away from what we know in the abstract works, which is advertising; otherwise, my constituent, Proctor and Gamble, would not be spending the millions of dollars a year that they do to sell a soap.

Second, we have good research on how anti-drug ads do make a difference. We would be, I think, at a very crucial time, setting back our efforts substantially.

Finally, I will say that there is some good data out there. I mean, look at Monitoring the Future, which is probably the best single survey, nationally. If you look at their data over the last 2 years,

and even back to 3 years, we are beginning to see some leveling off, finally.

As I have told you, back in our own community of Cincinnati, for the first time in a decade, we are seeing reductions in drug use. Our survey, we believe, is about the best local survey we know out there.

We benchmarked to all the past surveys that have been in our local community. We benchmarked to the national survey, including Monitoring the Future survey. We are encouraged by the fact that by having what we think is the most aggressive anti-drug Media Campaign in any market our size in the country, that we are making a difference.

So I would just say that if the President is going to achieve his lofty and, I think, very appropriate goals of reducing drug use by 10 percent over the next 2 years and 25 percent in 5 years, which I know this subcommittee supports, we sure as heck better have this tool in our tool belt, which is an effective popular media culture campaign; where we are dealing with these kids through the media that they actually watch. That significantly includes television, but also radio and appropriate print.

So I know there has been a lot of discussion in this committee, as to how to best measure, and I do not have any single magic bullet there, either.

Measurement is tough, but I do think we need to be sure, as Members of Congress, that we're holding ONDCP's feet to the fire, and the Partnership's feet to the fire, on testing these ads, making sure they are as effective as possible, before they go on the air; and then once they do go on the air, continuing that testing.

That is totally appropriate for us to insist on, and I think that should be part of our effort with the reauthorization.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Cummings.

Mr. CUMMINGS. First of all, I want to thank you, Congressman, for all your efforts. It is certainly good that we are able to come together on a bipartisan basis, to address such a significant problem.

I just wanted to say, we have spent a lot of time in this subcommittee, last session, talking about the Ogilvy part of this process. Mr. Barr, he and I did not agree on 99 percent of things, but we need to agree that if the public is not satisfied that things are right with regard to the way the money is being spent, then it does not help the campaign.

I have often said that Republicans and Democrats agree that our funds should be spent effectively and efficiently, our tax dollars. I am just wondering, do you feel satisfied that matter has been cleared up now? I know you have kept your eye on it.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Cummings, that is a very important issue, both because you and I do not want to see waste and, certainly, fraud, in any of our spending programs.

But specifically, you say on this program, the last thing we want to do is have our colleagues, who have basically looked to us to provide some leadership, and particularly this subcommittee, to say, wait a minute, we are willing to do these ads, but not to have any fraud or certainly any waste of money in the process of doing some-

thing, which is pioneering. The Government getting involved in advertising is a big step.

So I was extremely concerned about it, as you were. I was at one of those hearings where Mr. Barr spoke about it. I think the issues have been cleared up, in terms of the specific allegations.

I also think that when they went through the process of letting the contract; I know you spoke with ONDCP on the public record, and I am sure you did privately, as well, as did I, on a private basis, that I believe that was a fair and objective process.

They ended up going with the same contractor, but only because that contractor won through a fair and objective process, and I believe that.

So I think we are back on the road. I do think there are some outstanding issues, and they relate less to the fraud issue and more to the question of, what is the role of that contractor? Should the contractor be simply to purchase ads?

Let us assume, as I said, that it was a fair and objective process; they are the most efficient entity to do that. In other words, they are giving us the best deal, the "best bang for the buck," in terms of buying those ads.

Should they also be producing those ads, or should we be having the traditional practice of production of the ads by the best and brightest in the creative process, in particular, on a pro bono basis, and then having the contractor simply purchase the ads?

I think that is a concern of mine. I think we, in certain instances, should allow flexibility to permit that to happen, when there is a timing issue, when there is just an inability to get creative through the more traditional process, which is, again, a pro bono process, where you have Madison Avenue's best.

But I think it should be very limited, and I think you and I are in good discussions about that with regard to our reauthorization bill. So that is the contractor issue that we face now; what should their role be? I think Congress appropriately should help to identify that role, rather than leaving it strictly up to ONDCP.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The reason why I asked you that question is, the whole concept of advertising and even treatment, it seems as if many Members of Congress and the public, I think are basically willing to allow us to go to a certain degree, and they are even a bit skeptical.

When you are talking about ads, and you are talking about \$195 million, and you are talking about drug treatment, and whether it works, I guess, first of all, I agree with you; that as far as the process of Ogilvy being selected again, from everything that I heard, I think that it was a fair and open process.

But at the same time, I just want to make sure if there are things that maybe were not in the previous legislation, if we have learned some things in this process; I mean, some things you simply cannot legislate. But there are other things that we need to have, as a part of the reauthorization, that might help us to avoid some of those problems, and I think we ought to try to do that.

I do not know what they are, I am sure. But I was just wondering whether you had some ideas, and I think you have given us a pretty general overview there; but if there were specifics.

Mr. PORTMAN. Well, I think you have raised an appropriate issue. I think I mentioned earlier in my testimony that I have a concern that this money, as the chairman indicated, got a short haircut last year.

Then when you look at it on an inflation index basis, it is obviously not keeping up with the cost of ads and the inflation in that business. So we have got fewer dollars to work with. We have got a huge problem out there. We are trying to leverage as much of the private sector match as possible.

Again, locally, we get a lot of this free, all together. We do not even use the Federal match. I think we have got to be sure that it is not spread too thinly, and I think that is one of the issues that you and I have talked and need to address; what should Congress' role be there? We should not legislate in a way that ties ONDCP's hands to be able to react to circumstances as they change.

On the other hand, if we believe that the taxpayer's dollar would not be well spent by being spread out over a lot of sporting promotion events, or a lot of Internet advertising or messaging, and a lot of other fora that dilute the central T.V. portion of those particularly; and also radio and print, then I think we should stipulate some of that in the legislation. We have not done that in the past. So I think that is a legitimate example of what you are talking about.

All of us run political campaigns. Some of us have to spend more than others. Unfortunately, I do not have to spend as much anymore, due to TV. But when I did, you know, all your consultants say the same thing, which is you need to have a certain amount of advertising on TV to make a difference. Otherwise, you are throwing your money away.

That general concept, I think, applies to advertising, in general, and we need to deal with that in this reauthorization bill.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you; pencils are not a big portion of our budget, when we are in a close race, and that is part of the danger. We need to make sure that your Cincinnati data is part of the debate. Because a key part of that was the \$1 million local match.

We either need to make sure that there is a threshold of advertising. Otherwise, the data is going to come back more and more negative. As you reduce the television advertising, it is going to have less impact, and then they will say, it is not working.

Then, in fact, we would be throwing away the money. If there are also ways that we can get—in other words, if you are going to go to things that are not on television, you would have to show that the market area came up with some kind of a match. We need to look at some kind of a creative way to dress up, because without a certain threshold, it is probable.

We need to look at some kind of a creative way to address that, because without a certain threshold, it is probably wasted.

Mr. SOUDER. Judge, do you have any questions: Mr. Bell?

Mr. BELL. Thank you very much for your testimony, and I just have a couple of questions, based on what you have seen and witnessed with the overall ad campaign.

You referenced the testing of the ads. What kinds of tests have worked, in your opinion, because obviously, there are different ways to approach that.

Mr. PORTMAN. There are, and as I said earlier, I do not think there is any silver bullet there, either. As I said at the outset, there is no silver bullet in general in this prevention and education area. We do everything, and come at it from all angles.

With regard to the ad testing, there are experts who will testify, in the course of this hearing, who will know a lot more than I do, and they are the ones that should answer this question, but let me take a stab at it.

My concern is that if the testing is done on a focus group basis, and that data is used to make a determination, yes or no on an ad, and the focus group is not large enough or representative enough, particularly of the group we are trying to address with these ads, and affect a behavior of, that it can be quite misleading.

I know there are people that do this professionally, who have been involved in this process, again, who can talk about it much more intelligently than I can.

But I want to be sure that the testing that is done is broad-based enough, representative enough of the group we are actually trying to address, so that we do not come to premature conclusions as to the effectiveness of the ads. I also had made the point earlier that we should test all the ads, and we were not doing that.

Mr. SOUDER. So some would be put on the air without ever being tested?

Mr. PORTMAN. Right, and others can talk to you more specifically about how that happens and why it happens. My understanding is that the goal now is to test all ads.

Again, you have got the best minds in corporate America out there working on this, so you should come up with some pretty good material; but even they, sometimes, miss the mark. So there is a need to test them before the taxpayer's money is used to go out and buy the ads.

Then once they are up, we should again see what is the impact. That should not just be focus group. I think it should be a broader-based survey of some kind.

Mr. BELL. And let me talk to you about that for just a moment, as far as the impact and measuring the impact, because we get confronted with so many different figures, from so many different types of surveys here.

Do you have a certain level of confidence in the figures that you relayed here today, in terms of the decreases that have been seen? Do you have any sense of confidence that those decreases can be directly related to the ad campaign?

Mr. PORTMAN. Well, the survey data that I indicated earlier is from our local survey. Again, it is 67,000 kids. It is a very substantial part of our junior high and high school population in Greater Cincinnati.

What the experts tell is that because it is an anonymous survey, and because they have gone back to test these surveys with follow-up questions and so on, that they believe these surveys are very accurate. The one concern that I have with the surveys is that they do not pick up the kids who drop out of school, because they are not there to take the survey. This would sometimes skew the figures a little bit, in a more positive way.

But I think the survey is good. What the survey showed us was that when you asked kids, have they seen the ads or not, they indicate yes or no, and how many times have they seen them, per month or per week, and then we ask the questions about their drug use.

Those kids who have seen the ads tend to be the children, young people—junior high and high school—who use drugs less frequently. I think that is about as good as you are going to get, in terms of that kind of a survey.

Now people could argue, gee, is that because those who watch TV more are, for other reasons, less likely to use drugs, I do not think so. In fact, you could make the opposite argument. I apologize to our TV people here, who disagree with that.

But that is the data that I use from our local survey. We find that data is pretty compelling. We also have the general data which is, for the first time in a decade, in our area, we have actually seen a leveling off, 2 years ago, and now this last year, we have seen actually a decrease in use, and a pretty substantial decrease, when you look at the percentage decrease, and still unacceptably high levels. During that time, we have had a more and more aggressive Media Campaign.

Mr. SOUDER. What about, as far as you also reference a lot of the ad being just on the parents now and getting them more involved; but as far as measuring that, and the effectiveness of that, and how many parents are actually responding, have you seen figures that give you a certain sense of confidence there, as well?

Mr. PORTMAN. Yes, I have. That is the most positive data that has come out of the testing that was done if the ad campaign. There is also though a lot of good data out there indicating that if you can get parents involved in talking to their kids about the dangers of drug use, that there will be a substantial decrease in drug use.

We would like to take it locally to the next level, which is not just talking to kids about it, but talking about the dangers of drug use and arming parents with the kind of information they need to be able to talk to their children more intelligently about it. We spend a lot of time locally doing that.

But the data there is unbelievable. There is a study out there which shows there is a 50 percent decrease in drug use among those kids whose parents talk to them about the dangers of drug use and get engaged in their lives on it. I have also seen data as high as 75 percent. I am not sure I would believe that. Again, there are some experts here who can talk more about that.

But the Pride Organization out of Atlanta has done some good work on that. I think, generally speaking, there is an agreement among the people who follow this much more closely than I do, that getting parents engaged on this issue, rather than, as in the case of many baby boomers, taking a pass on it, because they may feel guilty about their own past drug use, so they are just uncomfortable raising it; or they are just too darn busy, because they are passing in the night as they go off to their second job.

But if you can get parents to engage, that is the single most effective tool to reducing substance abuse. It is the best prevention tool because, again, the data shows that young people still listen

to their parents. Although they may not seem like they are listening at the time.

Mr. BELL. It sure does not. I have got a 12 year-old, almost 13 year-old, and an 11 year-old, and I wonder, sometimes. But I think that is appropriate for this Congress to focus on, in terms of testing the campaign; not just looking at the impact on teens, but also looking at the impact on parents, because we need to use them more as tools. Thanks a lot; thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SOUDER. One of our biggest challenges is how not to over-sell the campaign and what it can do; and at the same time, sell it so we get the adequate funding. It is a limit that we have.

For example, basic advertising principles would tell you that, for example, the Drugs and Anti-Terrorism Campaign, what it is doing is selling the link between drugs and terrorism. It is a supposition that will reduce drugs. You cannot ask an ad campaign to do the supposition. That may be a second campaign, where we make the link on that.

Yet, we are so busy trying to sell the basics, that we do not even do the normal two-step of ad campaign. Furthermore, the amount of advertising dollars that we have in this, compared to one movie or song that would promote a kind of a lackadaisical attitude toward marijuana, can be undone.

Then the last part is, all the sub-markets that come in each day; families where they may only have one parent, and it is a dysfunctional family that is at high risk. It is so complicated with a limited amount of budget. So we do not want to over-sell this.

Yet, what we know, fundamentally, is that this has to be doing tremendous good on any subgroup that we can reach; and that we cannot just do the Colombia plan that I agree with, the law enforcement; you have to have some prevention component.

So the danger is, when we sell this hard, they say, the data is not doing everything that you say; yet, if we don't sell it, they will not give the funding for it. So it is a huge challenge.

Mr. PORTMAN. Well put, Mr. Chairman; I am glad you are chairing the subcommittee, because you spend enough time on this to understand some of these dichotomies and complexities; but still understand the importance of us taking the lead, as a Congress, in promoting prevention and education as an important part of the overall effort.

Mr. SOUDER. Congressman Blackburn, do you have any questions?

[No response.]

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much for your time.

Mr. PORTMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SOUDER. If Chris Marston could come forward. He knows the drill, because he used to be a staffer here. He is one of our great alumni.

[Witness sworn.]

Mr. SOUDER. Chris, it is a great privilege to have you here today. You know the bill backward and forwards, having worked with it both from this side on the Hill with Mr. Portman, and now as Chief of Staff for Director Waters.



So it is a great honor to have you here today. We will try not to get too much blood out of you during the questions, and we look forward to your testimony, thanks.

**STATEMENT OF CHRISTOPHER MARSTON, CHIEF OF STAFF,  
OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY**

Mr. MARSTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege. Congressman Cummings, Congressman Blackburn, and Congressman Carter, thank you all for having me. It is a pleasure to testify on behalf of Director Walters and the administration in support of the reauthorization of the Media Campaign. It is a campaign that we are very proud of.

Director Walters when he was last here 2 weeks ago to testify before you talked about the same study that Congressman Portman referenced, Monitoring the Future, that showed drug use declining, that was released in December. We think the Media Campaign had a great deal to do with that, and we are very proud of our contribution to it.

Congressman Portman has reviewed a lot of fundamentals of the campaign, so I will not repeat those. But I do want to highlight a few things.

I am loathe to disagree with the man that I respect and worked with. But just to briefly correct one portion of what he said, we pay, in addition to the purchase of the advertising, we actually pay a great deal of the production cost; not the creative services which the partnership and the agencies they work with on a pro bono basis, but we actually do cover most of the costs of producing the ads themselves; the fees for rolling film, having a director in place.

Where ad agencies provide those services, obviously that comes pro bono. But in a great number of cases, we actually do pay for more than just the cost of playing the ads.

So in addition to that component of the advertising portion of the campaign, I wanted to spend a brief moment on some of the non-advertising communications which, while they do not make up very much on the expenditure side, they are an important part of the campaign.

To provide a little context, about 87 percent of the expenditures of the appropriated funds are for the advertising communications portion. That is having the contractor in place, having the production costs paid for and, of course, the very most significant part is the actual media buy for time and space.

In addition to those expenses, on the non-advertising side, we have several Web sites, an "800" number and a clearing house that provides for film and services that give people additional context and information. The ads drive people to those resources, to get the help they need and further information. We think that is a very important part of the campaign, and an important support to the advertising itself.

We also have corporate participation that we think adds quite a bit. It gives us some new delivery mechanisms for the same messages. It varies as to what they do.

For example, Ms. Blackburn, the Greyhound terminal in Memphis is providing free play at the PSAs on its terminals, and that is part of our corporate participation program. Borders Bookstores

are distributing some of the parenting information through their outlets.

Safeways in this area actually are printing anti-drug messages on their shopping bags. We have cellular phone companies that include statements in their billing records. Our expenditure in corporate participation is under \$1 million a year. So we think that adds a lot of value for a fairly small expense.

Additionally, we pursue some earned media strategies to highlight our message, often based on the release of one of our advertising campaigns. We do aggressive work to get some earned media to bring more attention to the message.

We also pursue, well, it is not so much earned media but related, in our entertainment industry round tables and our journalist round tables.

Chairman Souder, you mentioned the impact that entertainment products such as movies and songs can have on the culture, and how the advertising is sometimes also a small force to push back.

We are trying to change some of those messages that the entertainment industry provides, and we certainly do not think we are presenting a magical solution. But by reaching out to the entertainment industry, particularly writers and producers in Hollywood and New York, we think we are having an impact on having more accurate depictions of drugs in movies and popular entertainment. That is another small but important part of the campaign.

I wanted to briefly review some of the changes we have made in response to concerns that this subcommittee and others have raised in the past. Director Walters made some significant changes, and he was aided in that effort by a task force that included several of the folks who are going to testify today: the Partnership for a Drug Free America, the Ad Council, our Behavior Change Expert Panel, and our advertising contractor.

The changes are guided by our strategy, the National Drug Control Strategy, and some advertising industry best practices.

From a strategic perspective, we look at the demand reduction problem for youth as a public health problem. The vector by which drug use spreads is non-addicted use. No youth sees an addict and says, I want to grow up and be like him. That is not the way it works.

Rather, they are deceived by the lie non-addictive use presents, the lie that says, it is OK to use drugs. You can handle it. It is not a big deal. That is the force we need to push back against.

In order to do that more effectively, we are targeting 14 to 16 year olds, an older age group than the campaign originally targeted. That is the age group at which drug use nearly doubles among the population, and we need to present our message to the youth who are most directly exposed to the lie of non-addictive drug use.

Additionally, we have increased and made an intense focus on marijuana, which is the drug responsible for the most treatment needed among youth. More than alcohol, more than all other illicit drugs combined, marijuana presents that problem.

We have also shifted some resources from the parent portion of the advertising, which Congressman Portman mentioned as being quite successful, to the youth portion, where we think we have

more room for success. So we are going to put more resources behind our youth messages.

The task force also helped with integrating some best practices from the advertising industry. In particular, you have discussed testing today. We have raised our testing standards by changing from a procedure where we tested one of a group of ads, to literally testing each ad that we are going to air before it airs; and we have also increased the threshold for acceptance.

In the past, we had a short set of belief statements that we would test the ads against; and as long as there were no negative results, we would say, OK, let us go ahead and air it.

Now we are insisting on what I think is much more important, which is positive results on those belief statements, and that testing is a service that is one of the costs of our advertising contracts. So as you consider the balance of where funds should be appropriated and limitations on any particular role, I think that is important to keep in mind.

We have also instituted greater involvement by all of the partners in the campaign at an earlier stage in the creative development and production process. This way, we hope to make sure we stay truer to strategy and decrease the need for late revisions in ads that can be much more costly; because if you change something early on it is, of course, a significant savings over having to make a change late in the process.

We have also tried to make our ads more hard hitting. By that, I mean we have focused on more negative consequences much more heavily.

We have some other strategies that we think are important in terms of giving coping skills to youth, and enforcing the positives that they have for not using drugs. But we focused much harder on negative consequences, and we have seen great results from that, particularly with our last round of advertising that Leo Barnett prepared, under PFA's direction, that played over from last fall through the holidays.

Some of these negative consequences we have been trying to include are the external consequences; not just the consequence to yourself; but things like terrorism, the impact on your family, things that are external to you. We found that those messages can resonate, as well as messages about the destructive force to a youth, to himself or herself.

In addition to these changes we have instituted, we are planning an early intervention strategy as a new initiative for the fall. We are going to promote early intervention by peers, parents, and other influences with youth who have begun to use drugs.

To meet the strategic goals that Congressman Portman mentioned earlier, a 10 percent reduction in 2 years and 25 percent in 5 years, we need not only to focus on a prevention message to stop people from using drugs, but we need to reach out to youth who have used drugs, casually and infrequently even, but who have used them and have a higher risk of becoming serious drug users and addicts.

We need to get them to stop using. We need folks to intervene with them to stop that use. So that is one of the things that we are planning on in the future, that we are very optimistic about.

I would also like to address the evaluation, which is a topic that received quite a bit of attention. We have an evaluation, an expertly designed instrument provided by contractors to the National Institute on Drug Abuse, that has evaluated the campaign's paid advertising portion.

We are pleased by the results that it has shown on exposure and recall. Both were very high, and those are obviously important precursors to having an impact on behavior. We have been disappointed though on findings in changing attitudes, intentions, and behaviors.

They did lead to the positive effect of assembling this task force and putting together some of the changes I have just mentioned. But they may have also been misleading, and I think that is the problem, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Cummings, that you referenced in terms of the appropriators deciding that a lower funding level would be appropriate.

Unfortunately, the evaluation has been limited by its sample size to detecting changes of 3 percentage points over any period of time. While that sounds small, I am talking about the percentage change or actually the change in points from, say, 12 percent of youth who use marijuana to 9 percent.

Well, my math is terrible, but that actually is a 30 percent reduction. So 3 points is a substantial reduction. Did I get my math wrong? You are looking at me like it was wrong. [Laughter.]

That is not a reduction that we would expect to see in a 6-month period, and that is the frequency with which we have produced these reports. It would be virtually impossible to see that. Even in a 2-year period, that would be a remarkable sign of success.

So as we look at these evaluations that have come in each 6 months, it is really not a great surprise that we have not seen a behavior change that the evaluation instrument could register.

As a result of that and also the decreased appropriation level, we have decided that it is probably not cost effective to continue on the course with the current evaluation. So what we propose instead is a measurement system that more closely mirrors what the professional advertising industry would use.

What we plan to do is present data on the pre-testing of each ad that we have talked about before it airs, to show that both at the focus group level and on a quantitative level, where we actually do a survey on the ad, that we have good outcomes on belief statements specifically tailored to the ad.

So does this change your attitude; does it change your intention; will it have a change in your behavior; or, if it is a specific execution, like drugs and terror, do you find this to be credible; statements that are directly related to it?

So we will present that data to you which shows that the ads are likely to have an effect if they are exposed highly enough and have high enough recall.

This next thing we will show you is the tracking data that is provided by our contractor, which is a standard industry practice, so you can make decisions about buying in the future, to determine how your ads are running now. That tracking data will tell us about the exposure of the ads and the recall of the ads. So those are important steps.

But the big leap comes then, and we are totally satisfied with this, but we do not have a good alternative, to link those results to the national instruments that we already have; things like Monitoring the Future, the Partnership Attitude Tracking Survey.

These national instruments are not specific to what is the outcome of this immediate campaign; but they give us the general sense of direction and amount of change in the drug use problem, and not just in the behavior, but also in attitudes and intentions.

Also, several of them, although not all, have questions about your exposure to media messages, in general. So in that way, we hope to be able to link from our very specific data on particular ads to the national outcomes. We certainly will not be able to claim that the Media Campaign was responsible for the full change of drug use in any 1 year in either direction.

We think that it is going to give you the kind of information that you need to make decisions about the campaign in the future, along with your colleagues on the Appropriations Committee.

Having covered some of the things that are going on in the campaign now and changes that we propose to make, I just wanted to briefly highlight two items that we think are important to consider in the authorization. We will be formally transmitting our proposal in short order, to help the committee with its consideration of reauthorization of the whole office and the campaign.

But the two things I would like to highlight today are first, to ask that you include in the authorization a provision that has been part of the appropriations since fiscal year 1998, which allows us to pay for creative services when they are not otherwise available.

It is certainly our intent and has been our practice to rely principally on the Partnership for a Drug Free America to provide pro bono creative services. There are a few circumstances in which that is not a practical solution.

On some of our multi-cultural or ethnic advertising, it is very difficult to recruit a pro bono agency to provide creative services, and we do not want to leave out any part of the population in the reach of this message. So it is important for the Native American community, the African American community, some Asian foreign language groups, that we be able to provide those.

There are also a few niche needs that we fill by using paid services. For example, to highlight one of our initiatives, we have a site called Mediastory.org, which provides information to journalists to help them with their coverage. We have promoted that in a publication that journalists frequent.

That is not something that is a typical ad that would be in the paradigm that the Partnership for a Drug Free America works. It is also not a very expensive part of the campaign, either of those activities.

So we hope that you will allow us to continue that on an authorized basis, as opposed to just a reoccurring Appropriation basis.

The second change we would request, the FCC has recently made a decision that our media match, and the space and time that comes as a result of that, is not actually pro bono. The networks are giving it to us because we bought paid advertising. So in that way, it is not actually a pro bono service on their part.

As a result, the Communications Acts rules that require the sponsorship of an ad to be displayed on the ad come into play.

So for those ads that are not developed by the campaign itself, but play as part of our media match, they would have to be tagged as being sponsored by ONDCP, even if they are created by another organization, like Mothers Against Drunk Driving; the National Crime Prevention Council.

That has created a big problem for the Ad Council. I know Peggy Conlon, who is testifying on the next panel, will have more to say about that. But we would ask you to accept from the provisions of the Communications Act the media match portion of our program.

That covers the things that I had for my opening statement. I would be delighted to answer any questions the committee has, on any of those topics or anything else about the campaign.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Marston follows:]



**EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY  
Washington, D.C. 20503**

**Statement by Christopher Marston  
Chief of Staff  
Office of National Drug Control Policy  
Before the U.S. House Committee on Government Reform  
Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources  
“ONDCP Reauthorization & the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign”  
March 27, 2003**

Chairman Souder, Ranking Member Cummings, and distinguished Committee Members. I am pleased to provide this additional testimony concerning the reauthorization of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, with specific emphasis today on the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.

When Director Walters testified before this Committee on the National Drug Control Strategy for 2003, he mentioned the sharp downturn in youth drug use as reported in the most recent Monitoring the Future survey. For the first time in nearly a decade, drug use among 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> graders is down in some areas. I believe the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign contributed toward achieving those results.

Not only is the Media Campaign having a positive impact on our youth, we are convinced it is a leading change agent in the growing resurgence of a national climate of disapproval of drugs.

**The National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign**

**1. Background**

The National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign was launched in 1998 and was authorized for a five-year period by Public law 105-277. Those provisions were codified in Title 21 of the United States Code starting at section 1801. Although the authorization expired in FY 2002, funds have been appropriated to continue the Campaign in 2003. ONDCP's reauthorization proposal will include the reauthorization of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.

The National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign uses appropriated funds to conduct a broad-reaching, national effort intended to prevent America's youth from using drugs. It is the first fully comprehensive federal government communications campaign to focus on youth drug use. It combines paid commercial advertising, grassroots public outreach and specialized supporting communications efforts. The Media Campaign and its communications strategies were designed with direct input from the public health community, top commercial marketers, leaders from the mass communications industry, and national

experts in behavioral science and youth behavior change. The Campaign's strategy is to reach both youth and their parents and is based on established behavior change theories, forms of which have been used in other government campaigns and are employed by non-governmental organizations and private sector marketers. The Campaign seeks to reinforce existing anti-drug attitudes in youth, and change attitudes for those youth who have developed positive attitudes towards drugs. Although it takes time, ultimately, this behavior change process reduces the proportion of youth who use drugs.

#### Advertising

ONDCP has operated the Media Campaign using advertising produced predominantly by the Partnership for a Drug Free America (PDFA), which develops anti-drug ads by recruiting volunteer advertising agencies to provide creative concepts on a pro bono basis. The Campaign has developed ads outside of the PDFA process where requirements to address special needs or to fill gaps in the full range of ad coverage, including the multicultural plan, required these exceptions. The Media Campaign develops message strategies with the counsel of leading researchers, and then works with PDFA to develop advertising to support them. Media Campaign staff work with PDFA staff in the development of the PDFA-produced ads, with assistance and resources from the Campaign's principal contract ad agency and a special panel of behavior change experts. In a departure from PDFA's pro bono model, to facilitate recruitment of ad agencies to create ad concepts on a pro bono basis, appropriated funds cover the production costs necessary to turn ad concepts into finished ads. Finally, the Media Campaign, through its principal contract ad agency, buys media time and space in local and national media outlets for the placement of Campaign ads. In accord with the authorization, the Media Campaign only buys media time or space if a media outlet agrees to match each paid ad unit with a pro bono unit of equal value or other in-kind contributions.

#### Multi-Media

The Media Campaign employs media planners and buyers who rank in the industry's top tier. Its media plan ensures that parent and youth audiences see Campaign messages in many forms and in virtually every venue, from network television to billboards and bus shelter panels and from malls and video arcades to favorite Web sites. The advertising strategy seeks to surround target audiences with Campaign messages wherever and in whatever form they are reached by media.

Campaign tracking studies and independent evaluations agree in their consistent findings of high rates of awareness of the Campaign's brands and messages, from 60 to 80 percent, depending on age category, rates that rival top consumer brand names. According to Milward Brown, a leading national market research firm, the average brand awareness among the nation's top 1,400 brands is just over 62% for adults. Another Milward Brown study, BRANDZ, looked at the Campaign's brands for our adult and youth audiences. The study determined that awareness of the Campaign's brand for the adult audience, the Anti-drug, was at 60%. This awareness level is comparable to that of such leading consumer brands as Ben and Jerry's Ice Cream (59%) and Cingular Wireless (65%). For youth, the Campaign's youth brand, "My Anti-drug," awareness is at almost 80% which is comparable to levels achieved



by Mountain Dew (83%) and Motorola (79%). Through this consistent messaging, linked by Campaign branding, the Campaign is producing cumulative and compounding effects, which we believe have contributed, along with other prevention efforts, to the welcome down-turn in youth drug use cited above.

#### Multicultural Advertising

The Media Campaign includes the largest directed communications program to multicultural audiences of any Government campaign. We recognize that, to be successful, our messages must go beyond the dominant course of American communications to find ethnic minority audiences who are often hard to reach through the use of mainstream media due to cultural identities, customs, and languages.

Many of our multicultural populations have high rates of youth drug use that must be addressed, but some of these require specially designed communications, incorporating authentic cultural cues that reflect their unique heritages and cultural identities. The Campaign produces culturally specific, and where appropriate, in-language advertising for African Americans, Hispanics, American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asian Americans, numerous Asian national backgrounds, and for Asian-Pacific Islanders. In some instances, it is the first time culturally appropriate or in-language anti-drug information has reached these audiences.

#### Public Outreach

In accordance with the broadly accepted and recommended best practices of the marketing communications industry, the Media Campaign incorporates a range of public communications programs to complement its national advertising messages. Communications professionals have found that it takes more to seed long term behavior change than national TV and print advertising alone. For these messages to have resonance and persuasive power, target audiences must also see and hear them in their everyday lives. When youth see the drug issue accurately depicted, including the down side of drug use, these impressions synergize with messages they see in the Campaign's advertising. The same is true when they experience these messages reported on their local news, find them featured on their favorite Internet sites, see them in the programs or newsletters of their schools, YMCAs, local clubs and civic organizations, or encounter them in the promotional materials of major corporations whose brands are part of their daily lives.

The Media Campaign operates a nationwide, multi-faceted public communications program to produce these complementary messaging effects at the local level. Through its public communications contractor, the Campaign conducts news media outreach, creates and distributes anti-drug information products, works with national and local public service organizations, operates Web sites, and facilitates the opportunity for entertainment industry writers and editors to meet and hear drug experts who bring science to the discussion, and hear true stories of drug involvement from youth victims themselves. Finally, the campaign works with major corporations who lend their reputation and brand loyalties to the anti-drug

effort by generating co-branded communications, in many forms, which carry the Campaign's messages.

#### Grassroots Public Information Programs

News media content analyses show that less than ten percent of media coverage of marijuana-related stories address the harmful effects of the illegal drug. To address this limitation in media coverage, the Media Campaign planned and launched (September, 2002), a long-term program of media outreach on the risks of youth marijuana use. The Campaign is taking nationally recognized medical and prevention experts in marijuana directly to local reporters to discuss the myths and realities of marijuana, as well as arranging radio and television interviews with the Director and experts in child health, safety, and education. A series of media briefings have been moderated by education correspondent Betty Ann Bowser of the "The News Hour with Jim Lehrer." Roundtables have been held in Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, Denver, Miami, Philadelphia, Boston, and New York. Upcoming roundtables are scheduled for Raleigh-Durham, Seattle, Portland, Detroit, St. Louis, Minneapolis, Dallas, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Tampa, and San Francisco.

In the two-week period following the launch of this marijuana initiative, public information outreach by the Media Campaign resulted in 174 stories in top national media related to teens and marijuana, compared to an average of 30 stories per month during the previous six-month period. Through the remainder of 2002, the monthly average of stories on youth marijuana risks remained at double the number prior to the initiative launch. Subsequently, market-by-market media roundtables have maintained media attention on the marijuana issue.

#### Web-based Communications

The Media Campaign is particularly proud of its Interactive programs, which are pushing back, near-single-handedly, against the malignant growth of pro-drug material that today permeates the Internet. The Campaign operates two high-traffic Web sites, Freevibe.com, designed for youth, and TheAnti-Drug.com for parents, as well as several specialized sites such as, LaAntiDroga.com, for Hispanic parents, and DrugStory.com, designed to provide information for writers and editors of news and entertainment media pursuing factual information about drugs and their effects. Through advertising and content exchange partnerships the Campaign distributes its anti-drug messages to popular teen and parent destinations across the Web.

The youth site, Freevibe.com, currently averages over 500,000 user sessions per month, with average session times (over 6 minutes) that rival popular commercial sites such as SonyMusic.com (3 minutes 47 seconds) and ChanelOne.com (5 minutes 25 seconds). Freevibe's visitors are kids who are curious about drugs. More than 12 million have visited the site. They find their way to Freevibe through Media Campaign advertising on Internet search engines like Yahoo and Google, and popular youth portals like IGN and Bolt.com, and through content-sharing partnerships negotiated with these and similar Web destinations. The

sites enable the Media Campaign to convey accurate, science-based information about drugs, especially marijuana, directly to youth in confidential, personal and highly effective communications.

The Campaign's parent site, TheAnti-Drug.com, delivers factual information about all forms of drugs and parenting information related to keeping children drug-free. It offers advice columns from leading parenting experts and provides actual accounts from real parents across the country who have had to face the problems of drug-abusing children. TheAntiDrug.com also provides parenting information related to drugs in Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, and Cambodian. We incur about 300,000 visits to The AntiDrug.com site per month.

The Campaign complements its parent-targeted Interactive messaging with outreach to the place they spend most of their time, at work. Surveys by human resource managers reveal that parents of youth who have substance abuse problems are less productive, have lower morale, and use a greater percentage of a company's healthcare costs. Through the Campaign's @Work program, millions of workers are receiving anti-drug information and parenting tips to keep their kids off drugs through their workplace Internet and Intranet systems, and company newsletters, posters, and pamphlets. Participating in @Work are leading corporations such as the New York Stock Exchange, Arvin Meritor, AT&T, HP/Compaq, Northrup Grumman, and industry associations like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Soap and Detergent Association, the Direct Selling Association, the Direct Marketing Association, and the National Restaurant Association, as well as a number of Federal agencies.

#### Corporate Sponsorship Program

With the initiation of the Corporate Sponsorship Program, the Media Campaign added an entirely new dimension to its integrated communications. Launched in December 2001, the Corporate Sponsorship Program grew rapidly throughout 2002 and continues to expand with new, household-name corporations joining the effort each month—proof that with clear Federal leadership, America's private sector is contributing greater efforts against a common danger to the nation's youth.

Forty of the nation's top corporations, representing the financial services, fashion, telecommunications, transportation, grocery/food, insurance and publishing industries have stepped forward to contribute their talents, resources, and brand names to help multiply the impact of the Campaign's communications. Companies like AT&T Wireless, Cellular One, Safeway, Dole Foods, Greyhound, DKNY Jeans, Borders Books, Lillian Vernon, Cox Communications, Blue Cross Blue Shield, Blockbuster, Northwest Airlines, and many more are carrying the Campaign's anti-drug messages in millions of direct mail communications, lending their brand recognition in association with the Campaign's brand, donating free advertising space, promoting anti-drug messages together with their own national promotions, and providing in-store presence in thousands of retail locations. Much of this exposure for the Campaign's brands is simply not available for purchase and could not be obtained without the participation of these corporate partners.

Through our corporate partners, youth and their parents across the country are now encountering the Campaign's messages in places and forms they don't expect to-- in the mail, where they rent their videos, on signage at major construction sites, where they shop for food, clothing and books, in community murals, in their favorite malls, and when they travel. More than the sum of its parts, this added communications resonance enriches the Campaign's other messaging to create a credible, unrelenting national voice against drugs, a voice, however, that must be sustained to protect America's children.

#### Supplementary Communications—Ad Council

##### National Media Match Program

The original Campaign authorization specified that the operation of the Media Campaign should not harm existing public service advertising support from local and national broadcasters. Responding to this concern, the Media Campaign joined with the Advertising Council, the nation's oldest and largest public service advertiser, to create the National Media Match program. The principal goal of this effort was to create a mechanism to provide some of the pro bono match value generated by the Campaign's paid advertising buys to air public service advertising, in desirable time slots, from certain government agencies and nonprofit organizations whose messages reinforced or augmented the Media Campaign's core advertising. The Media Campaign contracted with the Ad Council to help manage this process.

Since its beginning in January 1998 and projected through September 30 of this year, the Media Campaign's National Media Match program has provided \$447 million in pro bono television and radio time to air anti-drug related public service announcements of 85 groups or agencies. Examples of these groups are: the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, the National Institute on Drug Abuse, the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, the National Council for Alcoholism & Drug Dependence, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Harvard Mentoring Project, the National Crime Prevention Council, the National Fatherhood Initiative, 100 Black Men, YMCA, the U.S. Department of Transportation, the National Mentoring Partnership, 4-H, America's Promise and Big Brothers Big Sisters.

The operation of the National Media Match enables the Media Campaign to address Congressional concerns that the paid-nature of the Media Campaign would supplant existing broadcaster support to public service advertising. At the same time, it serves to under-gird the Campaign's specially targeted anti-drug messages with additional anti-drug and substance abuse ads from other Federal agencies, and with messages that promote good parenting and positive youth development programs--all of which support the Campaign's youth anti-drug communications goals.

### Community Anti-Drug Coalition Campaign

The Media Campaign also contracts with the Ad Council to develop and manage a public service ad campaign that promotes community anti-drug coalitions. Over the past two years, this campaign has generated nearly \$197 million in donated media time from radio and television broadcasters, magazines, outdoor and Interactive media, making it one of the Ad Council's top public service campaigns. In developing the coalition campaign ONDCP has involved community coalition leaders in campaign planning and received strong positive feedback for the unique support it provides the coalition movement.

In developing the coalition campaign, ONDCP has continually involved community coalition leaders around the country. The Media Campaign has established an informal task force to solicit input and feedback on the campaign, and, at various times, the Ad Council and the pro bono advertising agency have met with various coalition representatives. In addition, the Media Campaign generates different opportunities to allow local community coalitions to develop publicity for their local efforts. For example, earlier this year, the Media Campaign issued a video news release featuring soundbites from ONDCP's Deputy Director and local community coalition leaders and youth which generated local news stories in 61 cities. And in the spring of 2003, the Media Campaign will help to drive volunteers directly to local coalitions by paying to tag the names of approximately 200 local coalitions and their phone numbers on ads appearing in local media outlets. The Media Campaign has received strong positive feedback for the unique support it provides community coalitions.

### 2. Major Campaign Revisions

When Director Walters arrived, he analyzed the Media Campaign and found that new direction was needed. Although the Campaign had made good progress in influencing America's parents to get more involved in talking to their children about drugs and in monitoring them to prevent drug use, the outcomes in changing youth attitudes and behavior were not showing the progress expected.

In the spring of 2002, Director Walters instituted a series of changes to the Media Campaign to improve its performance. These measures included:

- **Elevating the target age of focus to 14-16 year olds.** Although the Campaign's ads address youth from 9-18, in order to achieve the greatest effect, the Campaign must focus the design of ads on a pivotal, smaller age segment within the overall youth target to gain the greatest overall result. For most of the Campaign, the focus had been on the 11-13 age group. However, data showed that the sharpest increase in use was with the 14-16 year- old segment. This change was included in the design of two new groups (or flights) of youth ads whose development began in spring 2002. The first of those new flights went on air in October 2002 and was replaced by the second in January 2003, which is on-air now.
- **Raising ad testing standards.** Director Walters ordered that all TV ads be tested prior to airing. Previously, not all TV ads had been tested; rather, a representative ad

out of a group of new ads would be tested to ensure message objectives were met and that no unintended negative consequences would result. Moreover, due to the frequent occurrence of receiving new ads late from the development process, and with the press of air-date scheduling deadlines, testing had often been done after ads had begun to air. In some cases ads that tested poorly had to be pulled from air, disrupting schedules and damaging overall advertising effectiveness, sometimes for months. Under new guidelines, all TV ads will be qualitatively and quantitatively tested prior to airing. Additionally, testing standards were raised to ensure that new ads met a higher level of testing effectiveness.

- **Focusing on marijuana.** A key element in the new strategy for the Media Campaign is to concentrate Campaign communications and dollars on marijuana as by far the most widely used illegal drug by youth. We are convinced that by attacking the broadest area of youth drug use we have the best opportunity to achieve the greatest possible impact on overall youth drug use. Where previously, advertising impact had been dissipated through fractionated efforts against a range of different drugs, such as heroin or cocaine, this sharpened focus against marijuana is aimed directly at the core of the youth drug problem. This focus is reflected as well in the launch last fall of an interagency Anti-Marijuana Initiative. It is through ONDCP's sponsorship of this initiative, with the Media Campaign playing a leading role, that we expect to begin to turn around the dangerous and long-neglected tolerance of marijuana use by our youth.
- **Becoming more involved in ad development and at an earlier stage.** ONDCP's experience showed we could develop ads more directly on strategy if Media Campaign staff became more involved in the creative development process and entered the process at an earlier stage. As new ad briefs are developed by the Media Campaign in conjunction with PDFA, involving Media Campaign staff early, such as when volunteer PDFA creative teams receive their briefs to create new work, would produce better communication and more effective advertising for the Media Campaign audiences. The Media Campaign and PDFA agreed on a new creative development process implementing these and related changes in early 2002. This new process was followed by the creation and development of the new youth ads that first aired last fall, the second group of which are currently on air.
- **Use of harder hitting ads.** The Director demanded harder hitting, more sharply focused ads. He required that ads based on a negative consequences communications platform be the predominant form, with positive consequences advertising used to complement this strategy. Campaign feedback mechanisms indicate that new ads introduced last fall based on this guidance are gaining some of the strongest awareness levels we have seen.

#### **Shifts Resources to Youth Effort**

In a more recent policy shift, Director Walters has reinforced the portion of the Campaign directly targeting the youth audience. Media buying for the upcoming plan year

that begins July 1, 2003 will feature a budget reallocation at approximately a 60/40 ratio, youth to parent media purchases. Although the change in policy reduces parent-directed communications somewhat, the role of parents in addressing youth drug use remains a key strategy of the Campaign.

### **3. New Direction, Treatment-Early Intervention**

#### Early Intervention

In support of the President's National Drug Control Strategy, the next phase of new direction for the Media Campaign will introduce treatment into Campaign communications, beginning with an emphasis on Early Intervention. Although the Campaign's initial authorization envisioned and provided for Treatment as a topic, the Campaign thus far has focused on prevention. The Campaign will maintain, in fact increase, its emphasis on youth prevention, focusing on marijuana. However, the Director believes it is crucial to begin to address those youth who are still using drugs on a regular basis. Our goal is for the Media Campaign to introduce an Early Intervention initiative in September 2003.

The intent of the initial round of Early Intervention advertising and supporting communications is to reach parents, extended family, friends and influencers of youth (coaches, teachers, doctors, nurses) with knowledge so that they can identify initial signs of drug use, and when and what and how and who to turn to in order to stop their teen's drugs use early and safely before it becomes an addiction. We are also looking at messages targeted directly at these youth and their peers. Messages will acknowledge the need to intercede, the understanding that addiction, even if in early stages, is a treatable medical condition, and offer help with obtaining resources, from expert advice to referral information for appropriate levels and forms of professional assistance. Media Campaign staff, in collaboration with our Demand Reduction specialists, have convened expert panels and conducted the first of several rounds of focus group research planned to refine the Campaign strategy and identify appropriate messages that will be most effective with target audiences. Advertising creative teams will be briefed soon in order to launch the first round of ads in the fall.

#### Stigma of Addiction and Public Perception of Drug Treatment

Our concept for introducing treatment messaging into the Media Campaign envisions additional content in subsequent or supplemental rounds of advertising to address the issue of drug stigma, one of the most formidable barriers to successfully moving family and friends to intervene when youth have become habitual users. Planning is also underway to determine the most effective way to introduce the issue of treatment efficacy into the Media Campaign's communications programs. This is an essential element in an overall concept to recognize and get help for the thousands of youth who have become enmeshed by the effects of addiction. A widespread public perception that treatment does not work is a serious obstacle to getting professional help for youth who need it. Parents and family members must be convinced that treatment programs are effective and, in fact, essential in confronting the medical challenges of drug addiction.

### New Campaign

Taken together, the fundamental changes in the Campaign's approach instituted last spring, the marijuana focus instituted last fall, and the introduction this coming fall of a Treatment-Early Intervention initiative, mark a substantially new and essentially re-directed Media Campaign. We are moving the Campaign forward to take on new challenges and achieve real progress in helping America's youth to avoid drugs or to get help where they have become drug involved. Although we consider this a natural and responsible evolution of the Media Campaign, we recognize that we must gain the agreement and support of Congress in the significant tasks we are assigning the Media Campaign. However, we firmly believe that the Media Campaign can be the government's single most effective drug education and prevention program in achieving real impact on the lives of America's youth.

### **4. Evaluation**

ONDCP engaged the National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA) to provide an ongoing, independent assessment of the Media Campaign's effectiveness. Contractors Westat and the University of Pennsylvania's Annenberg School of Communication (Westat) are completing work on the final year of a five-year process. The next report from Westat would have been due in May 2003, based on survey data collected from July through December 2002. However, because of the interest in determining the effectiveness of the major Campaign changes implemented by Director Walters this past spring, the Westat schedule has been amended. Fresh advertising incorporating new Campaign policies emerged from the creative development and testing cycle and went on air in October 2002. Allowing for the lag between ads first airing and field surveys including them in questionnaires, Westat survey data would have covered only two months of the new ads' effects, far short of a necessary period of awareness building and impacts on intentions and behavior. Therefore, Westat will not write a report for May 2003 delivery, but will combine the July 2002-December 2002 data with January 2003-June 2003 data and produce a final report by the end of the year.

### Short-Term Evaluation

To gauge the effectiveness of new Campaign policies, ONDCP will produce a short-term evaluation that will compare the performance of new ads developed as a result of Director Walter's new Campaign policies and focus plus other communications incorporating these new policies with previous advertising and non-advertising efforts. For example, the short-term evaluation will compare results of the final testing of new ads launched in October 2002 and the follow-on flight of ads launched in January 2003, against the same testing regimen of previous flights of Campaign ads. Likewise, the evaluation will analyze data produced by the Campaign's on-going tracking study, which includes among other things, audience response against a series of standardized questions that indicate changes in intentions to use drugs, a key indicator of ad effectiveness.

To complement these measures, PDFA has commissioned a special Partnership Attitude Tracking Survey (PATS) evaluation, supported by a grant from ONDCP. This PATS survey will collect data this spring using standard PATS methodology, which will include



youth exposure to new Campaign ads that first aired last fall. PATS will compare these data to previous PATS data collected before the introduction of the new ads.

The objective is to produce a short-term evaluation report before June that should measure the comparative effectiveness of Media Campaign innovations and new policies.

#### Long-Term Evaluation

The present evaluation of the campaign cannot assess the efficacy of our current advertising emphasis on early intervention/treatment initiatives, and cannot operate from a relevant baseline. Nor can it provide the Director with the information he needs to detect the impact of his redirection of the Campaign in a time period of less than a year, without dramatically increasing the cost for a much larger sample. However, the cross sectional feature of the Westat evaluation to be delivered in the fall will contribute to an assessment of perceptions, values and attitudes in relationship to campaign exposure (over an eight month period) as a result of the Director's modifications to the Campaign. We anticipate that any measured effects on attitudes and values also will be reflected in the youth drug use changes as measured by the national surveys. The appropriate measure for changes in drug use behavior, ONDCP has concluded, will primarily rely on the established, major annual surveys of youth drug use that should reflect the impact of Media Campaign effectiveness. In the next year, the Monitoring the Future (MTF) study produced by the University of Michigan with HHS funding and the Partnership for a Drug Free America's PATS will prove particularly helpful. Data from these national surveys will be supplemented with data from the Campaign's copy testing process and ad tracking survey. A Campaign evaluation report synthesizing the data from these various sources will be produced each spring.

### **5. Authorization Issues**

#### National Media Match-FCC Ruling

In November 2002, the FCC issued a ruling that directly affected the National Media Match Program, described above. The FCC ruling effectively declined to provide an exemption for Media Match Program ads with regard to the requirement that all ads must identify the sponsor paying for air time. Previously, a TV Network could choose one of the Media Match ads provided by the Media Campaign, such as a National Crime Prevention Council spot, to satisfy the Network's obligation to air a pro bono ad for each paid ad unit the Campaign bought. The Crime Prevention Council ad did not identify ONDCP as the sponsor of the air time being used.

Under the November FCC ruling, all Media Match ads, no matter what Government agency or non-profit organization has produced them, will now have to state that the time has been furnished by ONDCP. Many of the agencies and groups that have been part of the National Media Match Program object to tagging their ads with implied ONDCP sponsorship. We feel it is in the Government's interest to allow these groups to participate in the Match without the distracting and confusing tagging of ONDCP as providing the airtime involved.

As they were supportive of this arrangement prior to the FCC ruling, we feel television networks will not object to returning to it if the FCC restriction is excepted.

When the FCC ruling occurred, networks required immediate compliance. This has had the affect of suspending the National Media Match Program up to this point. However, the Ad Council is preparing a group of National Media Match ads from groups that have agreed to allow the ONDCP tag to be used on their ads. This group of match ads may be ready to offer television networks by late March or early April. Although the Ad Council has found a small group of organizations that are willing to accept an ONDCP tag on their ads, the program as a whole remains in jeopardy unless a solution is found.

It is our understanding that the FCC based its ruling on Section 317 of the Communications Act of 1934. We favor a statutory exception in this case, one that would allow Federal agencies and non-profit organizations to participate in the National Media Match without the requirement to tag their ads with ONDCP as the sponsor.

#### Creative Control

Since the inception of the Media Campaign, ONDCP has worked closely with the Partnership for a Drug Free America to produce the bulk of the Campaign's advertising. We do not propose to change that relationship. We continue to regard the PDFA as the principal source of the Campaign's advertising materials.

However, ONDCP has been asked on several occasions whether PDFA should be the only source of advertising for the Media Campaign. It is our view that not only would this be unworkable as a practical matter but it would not be in the best interests of the Government as it would preclude the Director of ONDCP from exercising the responsibilities of his office.

During the course of the Campaign, ONDCP has found it necessary on numerous occasions to seek support directly from individual advertising agencies to produce required ads that PDFA was either unable or unwilling to take on. These occasions have frequently involved ads for our multicultural audiences, or to fill gaps in the multi-media presentation of ads where, for example, PDFA produced new TV ads as scheduled but was unable to also produce the corresponding print ads that were required at the same time. Moreover, the Campaign requires numerous small, narrowly focused niche ads to support its "Influencer" audiences: coaches, doctors, school nurses, business and industry, and the entertainment community, for which PDFA has told us it is impractical for them to become engaged. In the vast majority of these instances, the creative work has been done pro bono. However, in some instances, to meet the needs of the government, ONDCP has had to pay for these costs. For example, ONDCP has produced all of its Interactive advertising outside the PDFA process throughout the entire Campaign.

Moreover, in the conduct of ONDCP business, the Director has recognized cases involving the Media Campaign for which the Government's responsibility to act dictated quick action and direct management in developing certain new advertising, making it unworkable to engage the PDFA process, which entails recruiting volunteer agencies to

identify and allocate appropriate pro bono creative talent to a project. Such a case occurred following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack on the Pentagon and the Twin Towers. ONDCP saw the need to educate young people and their parents about the role drug money plays in the support of terrorism, as an adjunct to the Media Campaign. The urgency of the situation was paramount. Additionally, sensitive, previously unreleased information necessary to complement the advertising required close and frequent coordination with Government intelligence sources, including the CIA, the Department of State, the Department of Defense and the FBI.

ONDCP found that because of the urgency and the sensitive coordination requirements, it would be impractical to develop these ads through PDFA. We turned instead to our principal advertising contractor, which completed and aired the first of the drugs and terror ads in less than 90 days after being formally tasked. It is clear to us that, however infrequent, there will be other occasions where the imperatives of policy and ONDCP's unique responsibilities suggest the need to proceed with a narrowly directed, government managed solution. There are and will be situations where the Government must take direct responsibility and control; in this case, for some elements of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.

As stated above, ONDCP continues to regard PDFA as the principal source of Media Campaign advertising. However, it will be necessary in some cases to obtain advertising directly from our contract agency or other sources. In the discussion of creative control and the sourcing of the Media Campaign's advertising, a distinction has been put forth between ONDCP paying for production costs of new ads, which is the current policy, and paying for the creative development costs of new ads. We find that adherence to this distinction is impractical and unworkable. When ONDCP has had to obtain some new ads from sources other than PDFA, we have asked suppliers to provide creative development on a pro bono basis. For example, our principal contract advertising agency and its subcontractors have supplied all of the creative development work on a pro bono basis for the entire series of drugs and terror advertising and about half of the multicultural advertising. However, in sourcing other ad requirements, we have not always been able to secure pro bono creative work. Although infrequent, we have had to pay for some creative costs, and it will occur again. Additionally, for five years, ONDCP has paid the creative costs for 100% of its Interactive advertising.

Therefore, flexibility is imperative based on our experience in actual operation of the Campaign.

## **6. Conclusion**

The Media Campaign plays a leading role in the President's Drug Control Strategy. It is contributing to the reduction in the number of our youth who use drugs. In fact, we believe it is accomplishing a great deal more. We firmly believe the Media Campaign has been principally responsible, along with other public and private efforts, for raising the collective consciousness of the nation concerning illegal drugs in our society. And as the drug issue returns to grassroots America, the pervasive climate of disapproval of drugs, so crucial to

teaching and protecting our children, is returning as well. We urge the Committee to reauthorize the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign so that it may continue to play this critical communications function for our country.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me just say up front, we are going to submit quite a few written questions, so that we have it in detail. Let me also say for the record that this was sold as a national ad campaign, and the money for it will rise or fall on the success of the major ad campaign.

I fear, even though every single thing that you raise in your testimony and that you are doing has merit. This is much like what we each face in our campaigns. Every single proposal that comes toward us to possibly run as an ad sounds good. Every single thing for every sub-group sound good.

But the bottom line is, if you do not reach a certain threshold, none of them work. If you are trying to be something to everybody, you are nothing to anybody. We were powerfully close, with the amount of money that we have, and we got a real wake-up call in the appropriations process.

I was over at Appropriations yesterday to try to do it, but we have got a wake-up call that many Members of Congress feel that this is not focused enough and our results are not dramatic enough.

I agree with your more complex measurement system. But the bottom line is, we are going to rise or fall on the ads. We have got to figure out how to make sure there is a threshold there and how to work it through.

Now I believe that some of these sub-parts all sound good. But what I would like to know is, are you doing any measurement, like we are asking for the ad campaign, of the sub-parts?

Because my feeling is, probably your dollars invested are so small that your measurement, it would not be wise to be doing measurement of it; in which case, whatever percentage of the budget that is, is not getting measured, and that may be the part that is not working. I will let you address that question.

Mr. MARSTON. Certainly.

Mr. SOUDER. For example, how would you measure Internet advertising to see whether it is working? How do you measure, other than the number of people who hit the Web page; but if you do not analyze it as hitting the Web page, how do we know there are not just a bunch of druggies hitting the Web page to see what it is; or the same people hitting it 1,000 times?

You have to pay money for it, if you are only putting a little bit into it. But when you add up all these sub-parts, how do we know the effectiveness?

Mr. MARSTON. Well, Mr. Chairman, you are right. It is a real challenge to evaluate it, and if I could, I would like to address the beginning of your comments, in addition to the portion about specific evaluation of those programs.

You are right, that spreading thin is a challenge and we do not want to do. The one piece of good news is, at the amount we have been spending on advertising, we have had very, very high exposure and recall levels. So I do not think we are in a position where we are running a risk of having it too diffuse to make a difference. That is to provide a little context.

On the specific additional activities and how we measure them, an example would be a promotional activity we took. It was an open letter to parents on marijuana.

We did a type of promotional activity. It was a video news release and an audio news release that we released to a bunch of stations to generate earned media. We measured the content of stories that mentioned marijuana before and afterwards. We had an increase of 600 stories afterwards that portrayed marijuana in a more accurate light, more favorable to the position of, do not use drugs, than we did before.

Each program we have to approach differently as to how we measure it. But we are working very hard to measure our results, and we plan to include that in the evaluations that we send up, along with the information about the advertising.

Mr. SOUDER. Could you elaborate a little bit more on your multi-cultural activities, and how you see that as separate from the ad time? Do you do ad time that is counted in the ad time budget, that is targeted toward Black Entertainment Television, other specialty networks, or does that get counted if it is television under multi-cultural or does it get counted under the ad buy?

Mr. MARSTON. We include the multi-cultural portion within the ad buy. In the last year, \$12 million of about \$150 million spent on advertising was on targeted multi-cultural messages.

Mr. SOUDER. And we can ask this of the buying agency, but do you also factor in, high risk populations, whether they be, if you are moving from the little bit older group, from 14 to 16, do you look at the buys of what they are watching, for example, and where these targeted subgroups are?

Mr. MARSTON. Absolutely; that is one of the really important services that our contractor provides. We have target audience specialists, who provide assistance in the process of planning and buying ads; both in terms of what the message in the ad needs to be and in terms of where it should be played, to take into account just that factor of who is watching when.

Mr. SOUDER. I have one last factual question. Roughly, what proportion of the time in billings from Ogilvy & Mather go to buying advertising time versus other activities related to the campaign. In other words, what percent is actually media buy?

Mr. MARSTON. Eighty-six percent of their budget is for planning and purchase of media time. Seven percent of what we pay to them is for ad production, the costs I mentioned earlier, where even if the creative service is provided pro bono, we have to pay for some of the production. Six percent of it is labor fees, materials travel, and other direct costs that are negotiated as part of the contract.

Mr. SOUDER. Tell me what the 86 percent was, again.

Mr. MARSTON. That is for planning and purchase of media time and space, including the multi-cultural.

Mr. SOUDER. How much of it is actual media time?

Mr. MARSTON. The 87 percent includes all the funds that they actually use to purchase media. There is some additional money in there. I do not know what it is, but I will be happy to respond for the record.

Mr. SOUDER. Yes, we would like to know what the planning percent is, the other percents, and then what is the actual purchase time.

I have a technical question, too, to know whether, for example, if go through an agency, there is a 15 percent fee usually. So when

I want the media time, I want the media time without the agency placement fee.

In other words, the evening news in my district would be \$700 if you go through and agency, and it is 15 percent less than that if I placed it direct without going through an agency. I want to know what is the actual real purchase time percent of the budget.

I do not have a number that I am looking for, because I know people have to make money or they are not going to do it. But I would like to know how much of our budget is actually going into media time.

Mr. MARSTON. Certainly.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Cummings.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me ask you, as far as this purchase of creative talent, I think that is how you phased it, you said you want some flexibility, right?

Mr. MARSTON. To continue the practice we have with appropriators, yes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Give me an example of what we are talking about. Have we run into that problem? Can you give me a live and in living color?

Mr. MARSTON. Sure; I cannot cite a specific ad. But the Native American ads that I think you might have seen at a previous hearing of the subcommittee, those ads, because they were targeting a Native American population, it was very difficult for the Partnership to recruit an ad agency that just did Native American ads and have that as a specialty to work pro bono.

So in that case, we went and paid a Native American advertising firm to develop those ads for us. That would be an example of procuring a creative services campaign.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Now a few years back, when the advertising campaign was moving along pretty nicely, there was a finding in some of the testing that African American young people were not being affected. As a matter of fact, I think it was going in the opposite direction. Their usage was maybe increasing slightly, but they were not affected like white kids were.

What I did was, I brought the then-Drug Czar to Baltimore, and had him sit down with some young people, some teenagers, some high school kids, and looked at quite a few of the ads. They told him why ads were effective, and it was basically unanimous. I mean, I had about 100 kids.

I guess what I am aiming at, just talk about all the things that are in place to make sure that these ads are being effective.

These kids, when the Drug Czar listened to them, it just made sense why they did not think they were effective. So we are just spending all this money, and I just want to make sure we have all the mechanisms in place.

I guess the thing that kind of got me about that one is, I thought we were doing all this testing and figuring out, and literally, this little venture that we did cost us nothing except bus fare to one location. They were the experts. After all, they were the ones that were affected.

I just find it amazing. So often, we sit up here and we spend all this money on different projects; not just in the drug area. But we never even talk to the people who are affected. Talk to me.

Mr. MARSTON. Well, we share your concern and we have taken steps to address it. The way we do our testing now, we start with focus groups very similar to the group you assembled for General McCaffrey. We have taken their perspectives, based on story boards, descriptions of the ads before they have gone into production. We get their opinions and take in that feedback.

For a specific ad targeted at a multi-cultural community of some sort, we use that community to do the focus group. For a general audience, we collect a cross-cutting group of people for the focus group.

Then we go on and the ad is produced, based on the learning from that focus group, we do our quantitative testing. Again, we would differentiate, if it is for a multi-cultural audience, to play a specific communications media for them. We test it with that group.

If it is for a general market, we do the same kind of testing with a cross-cutting group of people. But we also test for negative, unanticipated facts.

So if an advertisement, for example, had a very positive impact on white male youth, but unintended by the creators had a negative impact on young black women, then we would say, OK, we are not going to go with that, because it is obviously going to reach that audience, as well.

So we take that into account at testing in those different stages. That way, I think that we address very carefully your concerns. Specifically, we do that now on every advertisement, not just on one of the group of ads or anything like that. So every ad is tested in that way before it is put on the air.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Talk about, and I sure we will have some testimony about it a little later, the terrorism aspect. I am just wondering exactly how effective they are and what was the theory behind them. Maybe somebody else will tell me.

I can understand perhaps right around September 11th, maybe it would be even more effective. It seems like as we would get away from September 11th, they might not be as effective.

But the interesting thing is that it seems I see them more than I see any other ads. It may just be when I look at television; I do not know.

But on the other hand, I am concerned about our young people being affected. I do not know how much they are affected by those ads. Those who are going to testify later, you might be able to answer this question. Think about that.

I was just curious and, as a matter of fact, I have heard it in some of my town meetings. Because they know that I have something to do with this campaign, and they wonder why their tax dollars are being used talking about terrorism.

They would almost rather see the kind of ads where Venus and Serena Williams were featured or, you know, something that could relate to their kids. So I was just curious about that.

Mr. MARSTON. Sure, and I am actually pleased to hear that you see more of those ads than you do of other ads and that members



of your communities do. Because we are targeting adults and people who influence youth opinions with those drugs and terrorists. They were not specifically targeted at our younger youth audience.

If the folks at your town hall meetings were seeing ads with Serena and Venus Williams, I hope that was when they were watching television with their children, because that is who we are targeting with those ads.

So much of the function of what you see and when you see it is a reflection of our buying strategy in reaching the kind of target that we are trying to reach.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Boy, that was a smooth answer; 2 points. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARSTON. Thank you, sir; additionally, we have reached the same conclusion you have relating to effectiveness on drugs and terror and the distance in time between September 11th. We actually are slated to end our drugs and terror initiative, I believe it is in late May or early June of this year.

We have done, as you know, several sets of those, and we have tried to make them more relevant as the time got further away by doing different things with them. But that initiative will be coming to an end.

Mr. CUMMINGS. But let me just say, that is not to say that I do not think they are not excellent. I think they are excellent, the drugs and terrorism. I just wonder about the effectiveness.

Mr. MARSTON. Sure.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you; Judge Carter.

Mr. CARTER. I guess I am going to ask a couple of questions, because I agree that those are adult ads, the terrorism ads, and that was my comment just a moment ago to Congresswoman Blackburn. Your target audience, is it the young people, or is it all dope smokers in America?

Mr. MARSTON. The target we are trying to affect the behavior of is youth in America. We have two strategies to do that. One is to target them directly with our advertising efforts. A second is to target their parents and other people who have influence over them, to get them not to engage in that behavior.

Mr. CARTER. But you are not trying to convert the parents.

Mr. MARSTON. That is not a primary objective, no. If we do it, we will be very happy; but it is not one of our objectives.

Mr. CARTER. If I am understanding this correctly, because I am new at this; I am not new at drugs, but I am new at this, you are basically using television and radio almost exclusively. Is that correct?

Mr. MARSTON. The bulk of our spending is television and radio. We also do print and we do some Internet advertising to drive folks to the Web sites we do, that provide additional information. We also put the Web address on the radio and television.

Mr. CARTER. Well, when I hear the word "campaign," of course, I think about a campaign I just running.

Mr. MARSTON. Sure.

Mr. CARTER. Being the poor kid on the block, I was not running a whole lot of television and radio, but we did direct mail.

I happened to have raised four kids. I have never had one of my kids ever receive a piece of mail that they did not open, because

they do not get that much mail. Have you ever, at all, thought about doing direct mail?

Mr. MARSTON. I have not been with the campaign since its inception. I do not know that we have considered that, but we can certainly give it a look.

Mr. CARTER. I will tell you an experience that I had. I was a Juvenile Justice Judge, on a rotation basis, several times. In Texas, when you become 17, you are an adult in the eyes of the law.

I can tell you where your at-risk kids are; they have dropped out of school. You know, most of your juvenile justice people know where they are.

We send all 17 year olds on their birthday, that are at-risk kids, and there are about maybe a couple thousand of them, a birthday card on their birthday, on their 17th birthday. It said, "happy birthday," on the front, and it has got a cake. If we open up the cake, the cake is behind bars and it says, congratulations, you are now an adult in the eyes of the law. If you decide to break the law, you will go to the penitentiary; happy birthday.

That is one of the most effective things we have ever done. Kids tell us about it, and it scares them to death. We get comments; we get calls. You are talking about an eye opening, as you kids say; and these are kids that have been in trouble and are at-risk.

But they have been in the juvenile system, and they realize now that they are not playing in the juvenile system any more. They are playing in the adult system. I will tell you, it is very effective.

Mr. MARSTON. Judge Carter, it sounds like a very interesting program. What I am going to do is share it with the folks who run our Drug Free Communities Program, and suggest to community coalitions that they consider an initiative like that.

We will also take a look at whether mail might be a good strategy for the media campaign. One thing you should be aware of is, some of our corporate participation, while probably not as directly targeted at youth; although the ones who use cell phones and pay their own bills would get billing statements that have our anti-drug messages. I do not think that is going to save the day, but it is one more way that we use corporate participation to reinforce the messages of the campaign.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Bell.

Mr. BELL. Thank you very much for being here today and for your testimony. I am curious, how much control do you all have over the creative content of the ads that are being disseminated?

Mr. MARSTON. Well, it is, of course, the Director's final decision as to whether we air an ad or not.

Mr. BELL. You have the final say?

Mr. MARSTON. Absolutely.

Mr. BELL. So any testing of the ad and that sort of thing, are you responsible for that, as well?

Mr. MARSTON. Our contractor provides the testing, but we review the results.

Mr. BELL. I know you talked about some possible changes in the direction of the campaign. But I am kind of curious, going back to the previous testimony, a lot of the focus has been on parents and that seems to be a goal here of late. Is that fair?

Mr. MARSTON. It is definitely an important part of the campaign. One thing we are thinking about doing, we have had a lot of success with parents, and we are going to move some of our resources off of parents onto youth, but we still plan to maintain that parent communication effort.

Mr. BELL. My original background was in journalism, not in advertising. I can sit up here and try to be an expert in advertising, but I also kind of like to take a common sense approach to some of these things.

So when my staff was preparing and looking at some of the ads for today's hearing, we were somewhat surprised, because here is one. It was on A-8 of the Washington Post, and it is the dime bag ad. "Is it OK to support terrorism, if it is only a little bit. So you buy a dime bag occasionally?" You are familiar with the ad?

Mr. MARSTON. I am.

Mr. BELL. Who did you all think might be reading the Washington Post that is buying all the dime bags out there?

Mr. MARSTON. Well, that is certainly targeted at our parent and youth influence or audience, we call it; folks who are going to have an influence on youth decisionmaking.

We want to reinforce the negative consequences, and give them a negative consequence to reinforce with youth when they talk to kids about drugs.

Mr. BELL. Well, I guess that is where I am getting a little confused. Because most parents, you would hope, would understand the negative effects of drugs, going in. You do not really have to sell them that their kids using drugs is a negative. You are trying to sell them on the fact they need to sit down and talk to their kids about it being negative, correct?

Mr. MARSTON. I would definitely agree that we are trying to sell them on that. But I also think that there is not as high awareness as you might think among parents about the extent of drug use and the chance that their child, in particular, might be someone who is at risk.

So we need to reinforce that message with parents and get them to pay attention to the issues, so that they can take that opportunity to communicate with their kids about it.

Mr. BELL. Well, if a parent is completely out of the drug culture, let us say, would they even know what a dime bag is?

Mr. MARSTON. Not being a parent, I am not in a very good position to answer. But I think that is a sufficiently common expression for particularly baby boomer parents, who have been a real problem for us.

As you know, some parents in that generation who experimented with drugs in their youth are uncomfortable talking to their kids about drugs, and feel like they are not in a good position to do it, because of their own past use. So we need to reach that group, and I am sure that they are familiar with the expression, dime bag.

Mr. BELL. The same ad, in the National Journal, focused on who?

Mr. MARSTON. The same target, the adult and youth influencer population.

Mr. BELL. Do you see where I am going? I am just a little bit confused on the focus of the campaign. Has that been one of the

problem areas for the campaign, knowing exactly where to channel the resources?

Mr. MARSTON. Well, it is always a problem for any advertising campaign to do your targeting in the best way possible. But we think we have worked really hard to do that, and I think the placement strategy is actually working.

As Congressman Portman mentioned, our effort to reach parents is actually what has been demonstrated to be the most successful evaluation tool we have been using.

Mr. BELL. One of the studies backs that up, the NIDA study. It showed that it was having some demonstrable effects with parents.

Mr. MARSTON. Yes.

Mr. BELL. But then the study did not, however, show any demonstrable effect on youth attitudes toward use of marijuana, widely considered a gateway drug.

Mr. MARSTON. That is correct, and that is why Director Walters took very aggressive steps to change the focus of the campaign to change the age focus to 14 to 16, to intensively cover marijuana, and to do all of the testing of each ad before it goes on, to make sure that we have that impact.

So the other thing that I mentioned about the evaluation is the problem it has in the scope of change that has to occur for it to appear as a statistically significant event in the survey. You actually have to have a 3 point change.

So, for example, youth marijuana use would have to go down from 12 percent to 9 percent, over whatever period the evaluation is reporting on, for it actually to be detected. Over a 6-month period, which is the frequency of the reports, that is extremely unlikely to happen.

Mr. BELL. Congressman Portman was also talking about the testing. Have you been at it long enough where you can get a pretty good test sample before an ad begins running, where you can have some certainty that it is going to have an impact on your targeted audience?

Mr. MARSTON. I think we have. We use an advertising contractor who has extensive experience in testing. We have changed the testing protocol, using a lot of ad industry experts, who were on that task force that I mentioned, who helped inform some of the changes we made to the campaign, to decide on the testing protocol, what kind of sample, how to collect the data. So to the extent the advertising industry is successful in doing that, we think we are, too.

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SOUDER. Congresswoman Blackburn.

Ms. BLACKBURN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Marston, thank you so much. I want to move back for just a moment and talk about your percentages on how you are spending your money and the media buy, production and media buy. Now, 7 percent of that is on production, and 6 percent is on labor fees.

What I would like to know about that production portion, what rate are you paying? Are you paying the market rate on that? Do you have a favored rate, that everybody works at a reduced rate for you? How do you arrive at the rate that you pay?

Mr. MARSTON. On the production costs, we actually do have a very favorable rate. Because it is a public service campaign, we have been able to secure that.

Additionally, to make sure that all of the costs are acceptable and within the range of what should be paid, we have a subcontractor, Madison Avenue Management, which reviews the invoices for us and tells us if they are acceptable costs or not, so we can make a decision about payment on production costs.

Ms. BLACKBURN. Do they charge a fee for that?

Mr. MARSTON. They do, but it is a function, review of invoices, that would have to be performed by a Government employee, if it were not performed by them. So it is a function we have to expend resources on anyway.

Ms. BLACKBURN. What is their fee, their percentage?

Mr. MARSTON. It is actually not on a percentage fee basis. They do it on an annual contract, and it is between \$250,000 and \$300,000 a year.

Ms. BLACKBURN. So then 73 percent of that budget is being actually used for a media buy.

Mr. MARSTON. I am sorry, my presentation of the numbers might have been confusing. The percentages happen at so many levels, because there are different contracts.

The 87 percent of the funds paid to our principal contractor for advertising services, that is what is going to the buy and the planning and expenses. Seven percent is what goes to pay for those production costs.

Those are the invoices that are reviewed by the subcontractor I mentioned, and 6 percent goes to pay the fees for labor and expenses of the contractor.

Ms. BLACKBURN. Let me ask you this. Would you mind giving us a line item break-out on how that money is being spent? Would you submit that?

Mr. MARSTON. I would certainly be happy to provide more information.

Ms. BLACKBURN. That would be great. I think that would be very helpful for us to know that. Because I think that looking at paying a percentage for the purchase, one of the things that actually concerns me is that you have got companies that are giving their creative services to Partnership for a Drug Free America, and they are doing that on a pro bono basis.

The concern would be that they would stop doing that, because there are companies that are being compensated for their work.

I think what I would like to do is look at your budget and see how it is that you are using those funds that are going into that campaign. That would be great.

Mr. MARSTON. Certainly; the advertising industry has been very generous in the pro bono creative services they provided through the Partnership. That is why we limit as much as possible how much we spend on creative to the few areas that I mentioned, the multi-cultural and the niche ads where it is not available.

It has not been a problem, as far as I am aware of, but I am sure the Partnership can tell you more when they testify, that folks in other parts of the advertising industry, such as buying and produc-

tion, have not made all those services available pro bono, so long as it is the creative that has made pro bono.

We will be happy to provide additional information. If it is all right with you, I am going to have someone followup with your staff to find out specifically which line items you would like it broken out in.

Because frankly, it is much more confusing than I have ever been able to understand when I read the accounting tables. But we will make sure we get you the information you need.

Ms. BLACKBURN. Unfortunately, most Government budgets are. I think it would help us if we were able to have a better feel for exactly what the dollar items are, and where you guys are placing those.

I commend you for looking at some non-traditional marketing avenues, when you are dealing with youth and trying to communicate a message. I think that is tremendously important.

I would hope that the individuals who are doing your media buys have access to your survey information and your focus group information, as to what is working.

Mr. MARSTON. Absolutely; all of the partners work very closely together on that decisionmaking.

Ms. BLACKBURN. One other thing you had not mentioned, we talked a bit about the electronic media, the Web-based media, the print media.

Mr. MARSTON. Yes.

Ms. BLACKBURN. Are you looking at anything on an interactive basis, working with tours and entertainers and concerts, and some of those on-the-ground efforts that are so appealing? When you look at your 14 to 16 target market and the things they go for, those concerts and tours, and you have got some great corporate sponsor, are you linking through that?

Mr. MARSTON. Absolutely; we think that is a great way to do sort of grass roots marketing. One example is N-Sync, which is very popular in that age group, or was when we did the ad. They did an ad on their concert tour.

That was one of the examples where we needed to have the flexibility to pay for creative services, because the opportunity arose in such a timeframe that we had to just go send the camera crew right now to record them.

That was something that we were not able to secure a pro bono person or agency for that quickly. So it is a good example of why we need that authority that I mentioned that the appropriators have given us on a reoccurring basis in the authorization.

Ms. BLACKBURN. So when you talk about paying for the creative services, you are talking about the actual planning of the creative; or are you talking about behind the lens, the camera people?

Mr. MARSTON. In that particular instance, it was the creative concept for the ad.

Ms. BLACKBURN. The concept, OK, thank you.

Mr. MARSTON. In most instances, we pay for production costs, but not for the sort of brainpower of creative that goes into it.

Ms. BLACKBURN. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you; the newspaper ad that Mr. Bell referred to, did that run in lots of cities?

Mr. MARSTON. I believe it did. No, I am wrong, one moment. That was part of our adult influencer series, and it ran influencer publications with very large circulation, like the Washington Post.

Mr. SOUDER. Did they do pro bono, as well, as part of the package?

Mr. MARSTON. Yes; actually, to be clear, when we say pro bono, we mean only the donated creative services. When we talk about media giving time and space, we call it the media match, because of this confusion on the FCC issue. But yes, that received a media match.

Mr. SOUDER. So it is not just television that is under that criteria.

Mr. MARSTON. That is correct.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you; we appreciate your testimony today. Like I said, we will have a series of written questions with particulars for numbers and so on.

We certainly will attempt to address the two particular things that you said at the end; although it is not clear how much we will micro-manage the one that has been granted a waiver the last few times.

As you could hear from Congressman Portman's testimony and from the questions here, this is one of the big, unresolved questions that we are going to deal with, as to how much flexibility will be in the office. We are trying to work that out, as you well know.

The Senate is certainly going to have opinions, too, but it will be one of the difficult questions. What we have chosen to do the last few years is to not object to any waivers on the authorizing, to give maximum flexibility. But we do need to come to some resolution, and the followup questions will help us to do so.

Mr. MARSTON. Well, I encourage you to ask Mr. Pasierb about his view on that flexibility. Because I think that you will find that the Partnership is supportive, and believes that in the cases where we have used it, it is an important tool to have. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. SOUDER. Do not be too worried, but if we catch you in perjury, you may never see daylight, again; no, not really.

But we do this as an oversight committee, just to make sure, and most of you have been through this before, so you are familiar with why we do it. But we have had all kinds of adventures in this committee and the precedent is there.

So first, let us start with Mr. Pasierb. We welcome you, and we appreciate your meeting with us in New York and in other places here on the Hill, your past testimony, and the great work that you have done.

**STATEMENTS OF STEVE PASIERB, PRESIDENT, PARTNERSHIP FOR A DRUG FREE AMERICA; DAVID MCCONNAUGHEY, OGILVY & MATHER; AND PEGGY CONLON, PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, THE AD COUNCIL**

Mr. PASIERB. Thank you, Chairman Souder, and we appreciate all the efforts that you have done. Also, Mr. Cummings had to step

out of the room, but we also thank him for his work as the ranking member on the committee.

As a former Baltimore resident, I know the good that he does, and we appreciate your effort and Mr. Cummings' effort, in particular.

For the record, I am Steve Pasierb, the president and CEO for the Partnership for a Drug Free America. Our chairman emeritus, who is Jim Burke, and also our new chairman, Roy Bostock, as well as our vice chair, Alan Rosenshein, send their personal gratitude, as well, to you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership and to the committee's leadership and unwavering commitment to the drug issues.

I would also like to recognize the efforts of Director Walters, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, who is not with us today. He has done an enormous amount of tireless work since he has taken over ONDCP, and that is greatly appreciated.

I would also like to recognize Congressman Rob Portman, who was with us earlier, for his dedication to the drug prevention issue, which has gone back throughout his career, and also his leadership on the Coalition for a Drug Free Greater Cincinnati.

That is an effort, in particular, that we are very proud to partner with Mr. Portman on; and that is a campaign for which we provide the majority of the drug-related advertising.

For members of the subcommittee who do not know the Partnership, the Partnership began back in 1986, some 12 years before the inception of the federally funded media campaign.

With the deep roots in the advertising discipline, the Partnership is a very unique coalition of volunteers from the communication industry, who work together on a pro bono basis, as we have heard, to help reduce demand for illegal drugs in America.

Hundreds, if not thousands, of volunteers from advertising agencies, from production firms, from talent unions, the SAG and APTR people who work for free in these messages, who do not get their talent free, make this organization what it is.

As a non-profit, just for background, half of our funding comes from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the World's largest health care philanthropy, and the other half from some 200 private sector corporations and funders, whose diversity helps ensure our independence.

Our role in this media campaign that we are here to discuss today, simply stated, is facilitating the creation of advertising, pro bono, by the best and brightest throughout the communications industry.

We recruit and direct dozens of ad agencies in this process. In fact, through the life of National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, that number is somewhere near or above 50 different advertising agencies, who have volunteered their time to this effort.

We also coordinate the input of leading advertising creative directors, who review all of the campaigns. We bring a wealth of experience and knowledge to bear on the process. It has really been taken from our 17 years in running national, research-based drug education campaigns.

To date, the value of our net contributions to the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign tops \$120 million. Even in this eco-



conomic environment, the communications industry continues to find ways to give, and we are very much grateful for that.

Mr. Chairman, the Partnership wholeheartedly supports the reauthorization of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media campaign. This is a very unique campaign that Congress created 6 years ago it's innovative, in that it is taking advantage of the enormous influence that mass media can have in reducing the demand for illicit drugs.

While this media campaign has directed significant attention from this committee, and also from others in Congress, it is critically important to keep in mind, as you have heard from others, that as we discussed this and as we move forward through the reauthorization process, that since the campaign started, back in July 1998, drug use among teenagers in America has indeed declined.

It is fairly remarkable when you consider that very little national news attention has been paid to the drug issue over the last several years. We have got adolescent drug use, trending downwards or stabilized, in some cases. As we heard from Congressman Portman that was the first step in the great reductions that they have seen in Cincinnati.

We believe that the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign really has played a significant role in the positive trends that we are seeing.

Reauthorizing this media campaign is the right thing to do, Mr. Chairman, and we also believe it is the smart thing to do. That is because we know that anti-drug advertising, when grounded in research, when executed with the higher creative standards for its target audience, when pre-tested extensively for maximum impact, and when delivered at high levels of media exposure, can work.

Now let us be clear, advertising alone will not solve the drug problem. But there is a growing body of evidence that shows it can drive down drug use and the demand for drugs.

Independent studies on partnership advertising, from Yale University, the London School of Economics, Johns Hopkins Medical School, the University of Pennsylvania document this fact.

In fact, one National Institute on Drug Abuse study reported that anti-drug ads cut marijuana use by 27 percent among at-risk teens in just 2 years. In fact, the Harvard Business School actually teaches a case history on the Partnership business model of social change.

In market case studies, they also prove this point. We heard from Congressman Portman's Cincinnati coalition. This has also happened in Miami, in New Jersey, and elsewhere.

There is also the Partnership's own national campaigns, predating and outside of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. Inhalant's use is down by 13 percent since 1995; a change that Monitoring the Future closely associates with the Partnership for a Drug-Free America's national campaign on inhalant abuse.

The dramatic rise in ecstasy use, which increased by 71 percent in just 3 years, has been cutoff, according to the latest data, concurrent with the Dedicated National Education Campaign from the Partnership, focusing on this drug.

With so much evidence stating the value of media-based drug education, we have every confidence that this media campaign, with further improvements, can work.

Since taking office as head of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, Director Walters has indeed refocused the campaign on the core principles on the original mission of this effort. We are particularly pleased on the points of an older target audience; very appropriate for this campaign, as well a return to hard-hitting, negative consequences messages.

Since taking over as our chairman of the Partnership, Roy Bostock has established regular communication with Director Walters, to ensure that the ONDCP PDFFA relationship is strong, productive, and mutually supporting as one that is leading toward an optimally effective media campaign.

Above all else, through reauthorization, the subcommittee can provide safeguards to ensure focus of the Media Campaign in the future. We know and appreciate how seriously the subcommittee regards its responsibility, and we have heard some of that today.

In this regard, we believe the Media Campaign can benefit from some of the things that Mr. Portman talked about, in a clearer sense of the contributions made by each of the major campaign partners.

Surely, the effort will benefit from maintaining the Media Campaign as a public/private partnership. The Partnership stands committed to delivering the vast majority of advertising, to fulfill the campaign's needs on a pro bono basis.

Maximizing message delivery, both through purchased and matched exposure, must be a priority for the campaign in the future. Intensive testing of the advertising to ensure its effectiveness must take place before air.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely clear that the campaign needs a responsive, agile evaluation instrument; one that is useful and can form the strategic direction of the campaign.

Obviously, there are established and credible data sources like the University of Michigan's Monitoring the Future, as Mr. Marston testified, which can help us evaluate this campaign.

In closing, now more than ever, the Media Campaign truly is needed, and I know that you believe that. We are not going to find a more efficient way of reaching millions of kids with consistent and impactful messages about the dangers of illicit drugs than through media-based education campaigns like this.

This program requires less than 1 percent of the Federal drug budget. Taxpayers invest about \$8 per teen, per year, in this campaign. It is a wise and honest investment, one that the vast majority of Americans have supported in the past.

With continued improvements and your leadership, the investment in this campaign will prove to be one of the best investments ever made in a federally funded prevention program. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Pasierb follows:]

**Testimony of Stephen J. Pasierb,  
President & CEO, Partnership for a Drug-Free America®**

**Hearing on the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign before the  
House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources**

**The Honorable Mark Souder, Chairman  
The Honorable Elijah Cummings, Ranking Member**

**United States House of Representatives, March 27, 2003**

**Introduction**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Cummings and members of the subcommittee for inviting me to testify on the reauthorization of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign (NYADMC, or “the campaign”).

My name is Steve Pasierb and I am president and chief executive officer of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America (PDFA). As you know, Jim Burke, our chairman emeritus, helped the Partnership become the single largest public service initiative in the history of advertising.

Our current senior executives – our new chairman, Roy Bostock, the recently retired chairman of Bcom3; and our vice chairman, Allen Rosenshine, chairman and CEO of BBDO Worldwide – send their personal gratitude to you, Mr. Chairman, Congressman Cummings and members of the subcommittee for your unwavering commitment to the drug issue, and to this media campaign.

Before I begin, let me recognize and thank John Walters, director of the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP), for his work at the helm of ONDCP. Thanks, also, to Congressman Rob Portman, for his dedication to drug prevention and education, and for his leadership on the Coalition for a Drug-Free Greater Cincinnati. We’re pleased to be here today with our colleagues from the Advertising Council, as well as Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America, which has thrived under the leadership of General Art Dean. Finally, Mr. Chairman, allow me to thank the dedicated and generous professionals from the advertising industry, from the American Association of Advertising Agencies, from the Screen Actors Guild and the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists who donate time and talent to the Partnership for a Drug-Free America. Hundreds and hundreds of talented professionals from the advertising and production fields make it a priority in their busy lives to donate work to the Partnership and the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. We all have benefited from their talents and goodwill.

Stephen J. Pasierb, Partnership for a Drug-Free America  
 Testimony to the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources  
 March 27, 2003, Page 2 of 14

I assumed the role of president and CEO of the Partnership in October 2001. Prior to my appointment as president, I had the privilege of managing the Partnership's State and City Alliance Program, which replicates our national media campaigns on the state and city level. The Partnership provides all advertising material pro bono to state and local leaders, and works with localities to develop multi-faceted communications campaigns designed to reduce demand for illicit drugs. For states with tight budgets and no expertise in media-based education campaigns, this program answers a critical need. During the eight years I managed this program, I enjoyed working shoulder-to-shoulder with Partnership volunteers around the country. These dedicated citizens – most of them professionals in the communications industry – give so much of themselves to help the nation, and continue to do so, day in and day out.

#### **Overview of Testimony**

Mr. Chairman, we whole-heartedly support reauthorization of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. More than six years ago, after thoughtful analysis and consideration, the Congress created this innovative program to take advantage of the enormous influence of mass media in a new, comprehensive effort designed to reduce demand for illicit drugs among children. The campaign, as you know, is designed to combine the expertise of the private sector and advertising industry with the resources of the federal government to guarantee that America's teenagers and parents would receive consistent messages – primarily via advertising – about the dangers and the lure of illicit drugs.

While the NYADMC has attracted considerable attention from this oversight subcommittee and other members of Congress, it's critically important to keep this in mind: Since the NYADMC campaign started in July 1998, drug use among teenagers in America has declined. This – according to on-going national studies<sup>1</sup> – is a fact that we should not lose sight of during our discussions on the media campaign. It's equally important to consider that these declines occurred while scant media attention was being paid to the drug issue nationally. Indeed, despite remarkably little national news attention given to the issue over the last several years – save controversies related to drug-related referenda in various states, and the emergence of Ecstasy (MDMA) and methamphetamine – adolescent drug use has trended downward or stabilized. The NYADMC campaign was the single, largest program introduced into the marketplace during this time.

Reauthorizing this media campaign is the right thing to do, Mr. Chairman, and the smart thing to do because we know anti-drug advertising – when grounded in research, when executed creatively for target audiences, when tested for maximum impact, and when

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: Monitoring the Future Study, University of Michigan; Partnership Attitude Tracking Study, Partnership for a Drug-Free America.

Stephen J. Pasierb, Partnership for a Drug-Free America  
 Testimony to the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources  
 March 27, 2003, Page 3 of 14

delivered at appropriate levels of media exposure – *can* work. A growing body of independent research documents this fact, as do in-market case studies from around the country. This media campaign will not solve the drug problem. But the media campaign can influence decision-making among teenagers, and it can contribute to driving drug use downward.

Everyone involved with this campaign agrees that the overall effort could be improved further in terms of measurable outcomes. Since taking office as head of ONDCP, Director Walters has refocused the campaign on core principles of the original vision of this effort, as presented to Congress. Advertising messages, for example, are once again focusing on the risks of drugs and an older target audience of teens. Per the Director's request, ONDCP is now more involved in the creative development process than ever before. Better coordination and communication between PDFA and ONDCP has helped the Partnership produce enough new advertising to take the campaign through the first quarter of 2004. Pre-air testing of all advertising helps ensure every message has maximum impact with its target audience. And the Partnership's annual tracking study is now being deployed to gather data that will help assess the impact of these and other improvements brought to the campaign.

Since taking over as our chairman in December, Roy Bostock has established regular communication with Director Walters to ensure that the ONDCP-PDFA working relationship is a strong, productive and mutually supportive one leading to an optimally effective media campaign. As you know, Mr. Chairman, our sole objective for participating in this effort is to see this campaign work.

We know, Mr. Chairman, that the subcommittee takes its responsibility seriously and has spent considerable time investigating ways to improve the media campaign's outcomes through the authorization process. We understand that members of the subcommittee want to see the media campaign reauthorized, but only if this program can deliver bottom-line results. We thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the serious analysis and urgency that you bring to this discussion.

In that spirit, Mr. Chairman, we will share with the subcommittee a series of recommendations regarding reauthorization of the media campaign. Each and every recommendation is exactly in line with the committee's ultimate objective: maximizing outcomes of the campaign. Of all the lessons learned from the first five years of the NYADMC, the experience of building and running this media campaign has reminded all of us about the value of focus. We trust that the subcommittee will, therefore, do everything in its power to ensure not only that the campaign moves forward, but that it moves forward successfully.

With the country now engaged in war with Iraq, with the government and the entire country focused on international threats and the threat of terrorism, we cannot afford to lose sight of the threats that are closest to home, particularly the threat of illegal drugs

Stephen J. Pasierb, Partnership for a Drug-Free America  
 Testimony to the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources  
 March 27, 2003, Page 4 of 14

and the risks they pose to young people in America. Now, more than ever, this media campaign is needed. Mr. Chairman, we will not find a more efficient way of reaching millions of kids with consistent and creative messages about the dangers of illicit drugs than through media-based education campaigns like the NYADMC. Given the current appropriation for this program, the NYADMC requires less than one percent of the federal drug budget. It costs the taxpayers less than \$8 per teen, per year. It is a wise and honest investment that the vast majority of Americans support. And I believe, with continued improvements and definitive reauthorizing language, the federal government's investment in the NYADMC will prove to be the best investment ever made in a federally-funded prevention program.

#### **The Partnership for a Drug-Free America®**

Initially funded by the American Association of Advertising Agencies and with deep roots in the advertising industry, the Partnership began in 1986, some 12 years before the inception of the NYADMC. Indeed, the NYADMC is built on the foundation of PDFA's successful national campaigns. The Partnership is based on a single proposition: If advertising can be used to sell consumer products and services, it can be used to "unsell" as well. Again and again, throughout our history, we've proved that it is indeed possible to unsell drugs to children through research-based media communication.

The Partnership is a unique organization, one that I believe represents the best of what is truly good about this country. As you know, the Partnership is a coalition of volunteers from the communications industry, who work together – pro bono – to help reduce demand for illicit drugs in America. Behind this organization is a remarkable story of volunteerism – one that reminds us of the power and potential of goodwill and genuine spirit.

Today, the Partnership is run by a professional staff of 50, most of whom work from our offices in New York. Primary funding for the Partnership comes from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation; and more than 200 private sector corporations provide the balance of the Partnership's funding. Partnership campaigns have received every major award in the advertising and marketing industries for creative excellence and effectiveness. The Partnership is the only non-profit organization to receive the American Marketing Association's highest honor for marketing effectiveness.

Early on, this organization defined the application of commercial marketing techniques to addressing a major social problem. This involves understanding and serving the needs of parents and children – or, in advertising parlance, our consumers – as they relate to this issue. The marketing disciplines to which the Partnership adheres always have embraced the highest industry standards.

Stephen J. Pasierb, Partnership for a Drug-Free America  
 Testimony to the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources  
 March 27, 2003, Page 5 of 14

Allen Rosenshine, our vice chairman, and the current chairman and CEO of BBDO Worldwide – the third largest advertising agency in the world – has been involved with the Partnership on a volunteer basis since our organization was formed. Mr. Rosenshine, whose agency, BBDO, has been named agency of the year and international agency of the year, has said this about the Partnership and its work:

“It is my belief that the Partnership – that is, the advertising professionals and agencies that constitute this unique organization – has produced some of the most creative, most effective advertising ever done in this country, not just in the field of public service, but in advertising, period. That’s not because of me, or because of the senior executives who work at the Partnership. It’s because the Partnership’s work is actually the industry’s work. It represents the best the industry has to offer. We are, after all, a coalition of professionals from the communications industry. The organization itself doesn’t create the advertising; rather, it facilitates the creation of advertising which is, in a word, exceptional – not perfect, but exceptional.”

#### **The Partnership’s Role in the NYADMC**

Since the launch of the NYADMC, the Partnership, through the generosity of countless advertising agencies, has donated approximately \$120 million in advertising campaigns and material to the NYADMC. We receive no federal funding for our role in this campaign.

As Mr. Rosenshine notes above, we do not, in fact, create advertising. Rather, we facilitate and direct the creation of advertising donated by the best and brightest agencies in the industry. Advertising created for the Partnership is then donated for use in the NYADMC.

Our participation in the NYADMC provides the campaign with the following:

- **Strategic consultation:** The Partnership has, over the past year in particular, been relied upon for strategic insights based on our understanding of adolescent attitudes toward drug use, and our 17 years of experience in crafting anti-drug messages aimed at teens and their parents.
- **Access to a wide variety of talent in the advertising industry, via our network of volunteer advertising agencies:** Agencies working for the Partnership and offering campaigns to the NYADMC are reimbursed for production costs, but donate all creative services. This includes the billable time and talent of account managers, planning and creative teams, producers, broadcast managers, print and sound producers and many others.

Stephen J. Pasierb, Partnership for a Drug-Free America  
 Testimony to the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources  
 March 27, 2003, Page 6 of 14

Currently, the Partnership is working with seven advertising agencies, which are at various stages of production on 94 pieces of advertising, specifically being developed for use in the NYADMC. PDFA's roots in the advertising industry, and the Partnership's reputation for creative excellence, are driving forces behind the breadth and depth of pro bono support we have been able to generate for the NYADMC.

- **Critical input from senior creative directors who comprise the Partnership's Creative Review Committee:** This committee, comprised of leading creative directors in the advertising industry, reviews and approves all PDFA advertising. The committee ensures that advertising produced for the Partnership is consistently the best the industry has to offer. Having this caliber of creative talent available to critique our work is unique in our industry, and something simply not afforded to commercial clients.
- **Waivers from talent unions:** The Screen Actors Guild (SAG) and the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists (AFTRA) have been long-time supporters of the Partnership and its mission. As such, these talent unions offer PDFA an exclusive waiver on fees due to its members who appear in our advertising. Two types of fees – "talent" and "reuse" fees are waived. Because PDFA is a primary partner in the NYADMC, these savings are passed along to the media campaign.
- **Organization-wide support services:** PDFA's Creative Development Group, consisting of a full-time staff of seven professionals, is dedicated to fulfilling the creative needs of the NYADMC. The group works with ONDCP staff, ONDCP's contractors and PDFA advertising agencies to coordinate workflow. Additionally, the Partnership's Research Group supports ONDCP staff on various projects that support the NYADMC. The requirements of servicing the NYADMC touch virtually every corner of the Partnership's staff in New York.
- **Knowledge and experience:** The Partnership conducts the largest, on-going study on drug-related attitudes in the country. The Partnership Attitude Tracking Study, in place since 1986, offers unique insights into the challenge of communicating effectively with teenagers about illicit drugs. With 17 years experience in running national advertising campaign on drugs, the Partnership is able to share the organization's knowledge and experience with ONDCP and its contractors to benefit the NYADMC.



Stephen J. Pasierb, Partnership for a Drug-Free America  
 Testimony to the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources  
 March 27, 2003, Page 7 of 14

### The Case for Reauthorization

The case for reauthorizing the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign is rather straightforward: anti-drug advertising has been proven effective.

This is documented in independent research, in in-market case studies and in our own national campaigns that pre-date the NYADMC. And this is underscored in a consistent finding captured in the Partnership Attitude Tracking Study: Year in and year out, teenagers who are more exposed to anti-drug advertising have stronger anti-drug attitudes and are considerably less likely to use drugs than teens who see and hear these messages infrequently.

#### *Independent research:*

- **American Journal of Public Health**, August 2002: "Assessing the Impact of Anti-drug Advertising on Adolescent Drug Consumption: Results from a Behavioral Economic Model." Researchers from Yale University, the London School of Economics, New York University Stern School of Business and Baruch College find "strong evidence that anti-drug advertising decreases drug trial." Specifically, researchers report that the cumulative impact of anti-drug advertising is reduced probability of marijuana trial (by 9.25 percent) and cocaine trial (by 3.6 percent). The research team also finds that the availability of drugs had no association with most usage decisions, suggesting "more emphasis should be placed on demand versus supply side strategies for decreasing drug consumption." Block, Morwitz, Putsis Jr. and Sen.
- **American Journal of Public Health**, February 2001: "*Television Campaigns and Adolescent Marijuana Use: Tests of Sensation Seeking Targeting.*" In a study funded by the National Institute on Drug Abuse, researchers report heavy-exposure to anti-marijuana advertising results in a 27 percent decline in marijuana use among at-risk teens in Kentucky following two-years of heavy exposure to campaign messaging. Palmgreen, Donohew, Puzles Lorch, Hoyle and Stephensen.
- **American Journal of Public Health**, February 2002: "*Testing the Relative Effectiveness of Anti-drug Public Service Announcements Before a National Campaign.*" Analyzing PDFA advertising originally used in the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, researchers at the Annenberg School of Communication at the University of Pennsylvania report overall positive impact of PDFA advertising among target audiences. Study finds 24 of 30 PDFA messages, or 80 percent of those tested, rated as good as the control or better. Fishbein, Hall-Jamieson, Zimmer, von Haefen and Nabi.

Stephen J. Pasierb, Partnership for a Drug-Free America  
 Testimony to the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources  
 March 27, 2003, Page 8 of 14

- **American Journal of Pediatrics**, December 1994: "*The Impact of Anti-Drug Advertising.*" John Hopkins University School of Medicine researchers find that among middle and high school students exposed to anti-drug advertising, the majority identifies a positive impact of the ads on their knowledge, beliefs and attitudes pertaining to drug use. Further, 75 percent of these students perceive that the ads have a deterrent impact on their own actual or intended drug use – and even many drug users claim a deterrent impact of anti-drug advertising. In conclusion, the authors said, "our findings suggest that anti-drug advertising serves as a deterrent to youth substance abuse." *Reis, Duggan, Adger Jr. and DeAngelis.*

*In-market case studies:*

- **Coalition for a Drug-Free Greater Cincinnati:** According to the 2002 Coalition for a Drug-Free Greater Cincinnati survey, adolescent marijuana use decreased 13 percent from 2000 to 2002 while national rates remained unchanged. The survey also showed a 20 percent reduction in marijuana use among youth who reported seeing anti-drug messages regularly.
- **Miami Coalition for a Safe and Drug-Free Community:** Research conducted in Miami in 1999 documented an increase in social disapproval and perceived risk in marijuana use corresponding to a decrease in use of the drug among 7<sup>th</sup>- to 12<sup>th</sup>-graders. The study noted that the only source of information about the risks of drugs that showed a significant increase was television anti-drug commercials. The downward trend in marijuana in Miami occurred when marijuana use among adolescents nationally remained stable or unchanged. Miami-based media outlets have supported the Miami Coalition's efforts to distribute PDFA advertising in and around the greater Miami area.
- **Partnership for a Drug-Free New Jersey:** From 1998 to 2000, awareness of the risks of drugs increased significantly among middle-school students in New Jersey – the primary target audience of the Partnership for a Drug-Free New Jersey, which uses PDFA advertising for local distribution in the state. Between 1995 and 2000, marijuana use among this teen cohort decreased proportionally by 31 percent.

*National campaigns conducted by PDFA, prior to the inception of the NYADMC or outside of the scope of the NYADMC:*

**Inhalants:** In 1995, the Partnership developed and launched the first national media-based education campaign to combat inhalant abuse among pre-teens. Inhalant abuse is

Stephen J. Pasierb, Partnership for a Drug-Free America  
 Testimony to the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources  
 March 27, 2003, Page 9 of 14

the intentional inhalation of a volatile substance for the purpose of achieving a euphoric state. Our national tracking study, as well as the University of Michigan's Monitoring the Future Study, tracked a gradual increase in inhalant use in the early 1990s, driven by weak teen attitudes about the dangers of inhalants.

To prepare for the campaign, the Partnership conducted original qualitative and quantitative research to inform the strategic direction of the effort. The research revealed that teens had a well-established understanding about the practice of inhalation abuse, and the types of products their peers were misusing to get high. Additionally, teens carried a disturbingly low perception of risk with regard to inhalant experimentation. Parents, on the other hand, were found to have limited understanding of the scope of the inhalants problem (i.e., limited to glue-sniffing, by and large), dictating the need for a distinct communications strategy. The inhalants problem presented the Partnership with a delicate challenge: prevent increases in inhalant abuse without educating teens about the very nature of the problem.

Results: Since 1995, the percentage of teens reporting trying inhalants has declined by 17 percent. The percentage that sees risk in trying inhalants has increased by 13 percent.<sup>2</sup>

Commenting on similar findings in the Monitoring the Future Study, researchers at the University of Michigan said "the turnaround in inhalant use and beliefs about its harmfulness corresponds exactly with the start of the Partnership's inhalant campaign..." The study's authors said, "We are inclined to credit much of the improvement in inhalant use to that intervention."

**Ecstasy:** Between 1999 and 2001, Ecstasy use among teens increased 71 percent. Partnership research indicated that teens knew and understood the risks about regular use of Ecstasy; however, perceived risks of experimenting with this drug were significantly lower. In 2001, responding to dramatic increases in teen Ecstasy use across the country, the Partnership developed and launched the first, national media-based education campaign targeting Ecstasy. Prior to campaign development, dedicated research was conducted to identify credible claims that teens would accept about Ecstasy. The campaign -- consisting of television, print and radio messages, along with a comprehensive Web component -- was developed in 90 days. Campaign messages tested exceptionally well among target audiences.

Throughout 2001, the Partnership's campaign material was distributed to national media outlets and more than 250 local media markets throughout the country. At the local level, Partnership personnel made in-person visits to media concerns to underscore the urgency of the campaign. (Several Partnership anti-Ecstasy ads were also included in paid media rotations in the NYADMC during the late summer of 2001. Additionally, PDFA anti-Ecstasy ads enjoyed considerable media exposure via the NYADMC's media match.)

---

<sup>2</sup> Partnership Attitude Tracking Study

Stephen J. Pasierb, Partnership for a Drug-Free America  
 Testimony to the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources  
 March 27, 2003, Page 10 of 14

Survey data released by the Partnership this February showed that teen Ecstasy use had leveled off after three years of dramatic increases. The data, which reported consistently stronger anti-drug attitudes among teenagers exposed to anti-drug advertising regularly, suggest a correlation between this media education campaign and changes in the marketplace. Importantly, the data indicate critical changes in teen attitudes about Ecstasy, the very drivers of behaviors. The survey found:

- Three out of four teens – 76 percent, or 17.9 million – now agree there’s great risk in using Ecstasy regularly, up from 72 percent in 2001; 45 percent (10.6 million) say they see great risk in trying Ecstasy once or twice, up from 42 percent in 2001;
- Three out of four teens – 77 percent, or 18.2 million – now agree there’s great risk of getting hooked on Ecstasy, up from 73 percent in 2001; and
- Nearly three out of four teens – 70 percent, or 16.5 million – now agree there’s great risk of developing memory problems as a result of using Ecstasy, up from 66 percent in 2001.

This campaign will remain in active distribution until a significant decline in Ecstasy use is sustained. Please note that the stabilization in Ecstasy use among teens is consistent with findings from the latest Monitoring the Future Study, released in December 2002. Over the last few years, as overall teen drug use stabilized, Ecstasy was the one disturbing exception. Our latest reading of the Ecstasy market offers a more encouraging picture, but does not – and should not – suggest that we have turned the corner on this drug. We have not – not yet. While 45 percent (10.6 million) of teens now see great risk in trying Ecstasy once or twice, as many as 13 million teenagers do not. Much work remains to be done in this area.

#### *The Partnership Attitude Tracking Study*

The Partnership Attitude Tracking Study (PATs), a nationally-projectable study of parents and teens, has documented consistently strong correlations between exposure to anti-drug advertising and lower drug use / strong anti-drug attitudes.

Teens who see or hear anti-drug messages every day are significantly less likely than their peers to use drugs, according to the 2002 PATs. The survey, which questioned 7,084 teens across the country (margin of error = +/- 1.5 percent), found that overall, compared to teens who see or hear anti-drug ads less than once a week, teens who see or hear anti-drug ads every day are less likely to have tried various drugs. In fact, compared to teens who see or hear such ads less than once a week, they are 14 percent less likely to

Stephen J. Pasierb, Partnership for a Drug-Free America  
 Testimony to the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources  
 March 27, 2003, Page 11 of 14

have tried marijuana (38 vs. 44 percent); 29 percent less likely to have tried Ecstasy (10 vs. 14 percent); 36 percent less likely to have tried LSD (seven vs. 11 percent); 31 percent less likely to have tried crack/cocaine (nine vs. 13 percent); and 38 percent less likely to have tried methamphetamine (eight vs. 13 percent).

### **PDFA Recommendations on Reauthorization of the Media Campaign**

Today, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to report that ONDCP and the Partnership are in agreement on several key strategic issues relevant to the campaign.

For those members of Congress new to the subcommittee, allow me to point out that this media campaign was originally authorized with the bi-partisan support of the Congress.

The vision of this campaign was of a truly unique and focused public-private partnership, with a well-defined mission designed to produce maximum impact. In short, the private sector – namely the advertising industry through PDFA – would provide strategic counsel and creative development services, pro bono, to develop research-based, anti-drug media campaigns targeting teenagers and parents. The federal government would provide resources and, through a media buying and planning contractor, secure optimal media exposure for these campaigns, ensuring that hard-hitting campaign messages would reach their intended audiences consistently. The vision was simple and tightly focused on these tenets: Working with ONDCP, invest public resources to purchase media exposure to guarantee reach and frequency of message delivery. Leverage free exposure by requiring media companies accepting campaign ad buys to donate equivalent exposure for campaign ads. And rely on the private sector to bring it all together – to recommend testing procedures, research mechanisms and other industry standards.

When the campaign focused on the risks of drugs, spoke to teens 13 to 17 and aired that message heavily and repeatedly, the data indicate that awareness of the advertising jumped significantly, drug-related attitudes changed and drug use continued a modest but steady decline.

Then came a valuable learning experience for all. In years three and four, the campaign stopped showing effectiveness. Multiple themes were incorporated into the campaign's advertising, diluting focus. The campaign changed its target audience, mandating advertising exclusively to younger teenagers (11- to 13-year-olds) who predominately do not use illicit drugs. The campaign's advertising approval process grew complex and time-consuming. The majority of campaign's "match" – free media exposure for campaign messages leveraged by the NYADMC media buy – was not longer dedicated to the effort's core anti-drug messages.

Stephen J. Pasierb, Partnership for a Drug-Free America  
 Testimony to the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources  
 March 27, 2003, Page 12 of 14

Director Walters and the ONDCP campaign staff have done a great deal to bring focus back to the NYADMC. With a simple, research-based message, and with the appropriate level of media exposure, we can “unsell” drugs to kids. Indeed, we have. When the Congress signed on to the plan, it believed the concept could work. Mr. Chairman, it has worked when the campaign stayed focused.

Given the seriousness that the subcommittee brings to its responsibility to improve the NYADMC, we want you to know, Mr. Chairman, that we are committed to servicing the media campaign for the future. The advertising industry, through the Partnership, is dedicated to making this campaign work. We understand the subcommittee’s role in oversight. Further, we recognize the wishes of the members to hold participants in the NYADMC accountable for outcomes. In that spirit, Mr. Chairman, we offer recommendations for achieving our mutual objectives. As the subcommittee knows, the reauthorizing language will help the NYADMC remain focused and true to central tenets of advertising effectiveness.

Mr. Chairman, given the subcommittee’s desire to see the campaign reauthorized in a way that addresses problems of the past, and recognizes opportunities for the future, here is a summary of our recommendations for improving the impact of the media campaign:

- **Maintain the NYADMC as a public-private partnership:** The Partnership stands committed to deliver the vast majority of advertising needed for the campaign pro bono. (We recognize the need for the campaign to pay for creative services on a limited basis – i.e., campaigns targeting minority audiences; customized advertising for the Internet and potentially other specialized needs.)
- **Media exposure:** Continuity of heavy media exposure levels has been essential in successful and effective anti-drug communications campaigns. An emphasis needs to be placed on maximizing delivery of hard-hitting information to our target audiences, both through purchased and “matched” media exposure.
- **Testing:** Campaigns used in the NYADMC must be communications tested, per accepted standards in the advertising industry, prior to release.
- **Evaluate the campaign via accepted standards in the advertising industry, and include analysis of existing research.** The campaign needs a research instrument that provides timely data to inform strategic decisions relevant to campaign direction. Ultimately, levels of drug use should be the measure of campaign effectiveness. As such, the campaign evaluation should also take into account data gathered from ongoing tracking studies on drug use trends in America – namely, the University of Michigan’s Monitoring the Future Study; and the Partnership for a Drug-Free America’s Partnership Attitude Tracking Survey.

Stephen J. Pasierb, Partnership for a Drug-Free America  
Testimony to the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources  
March 27, 2003, Page 13 of 14

### **Conclusion**

Mr. Chairman, we whole-heartedly support reauthorization of the NYADMC. We consider the campaign an essential component of the country's efforts to reduce demand for illegal drugs. With further improvements and highly-defined authorizing language, we are confident that the NYADMC can deliver the type of results we can all be proud of.

As you know, the drug issue is extremely information-sensitive. Tracking data show that when people hear about the risks of drugs consistently, social attitudes are influenced and drug use declines.

More than 10 years ago, as American forces first went to war in the Persian Gulf, the government's attention and the attention of the news media diverted from what had been a top domestic issue – the war on drugs – to what had become an all-consuming issue – war in the Gulf.

Shortly thereafter, following a remarkable and steady decline in drug use among teenagers that spanned much of the '80s, national tracking data captured something rather disturbing: a softening in anti-drug attitudes, specifically among 8<sup>th</sup> graders. That weakening of attitudes continued as the drug issue, slowly but surely, faded from the nation's radar. When the Gulf War subsided, other issues – a sagging economy, debate over NAFTA and then a presidential race – filled the void. The drug issue was unable to regain its former prominence.

As you know, those slight, subtle changes in teen drug attitudes were precursors for what would become a slow, steady increase in adolescent drug use. These changes were concurrent with another change in the marketplace: a steady decline in anti-drug advertising appearing in national media pro bono. To wit, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to this example, the phrase "out of sight, out of mind" carries substantial meaning. As the anti-drug drumbeat faded away, new generations of kids discovered illicit drugs, with marijuana leading the way.

My point, Mr. Chairman, is this: With the country at war in the Persian Gulf once again, with the government and the entire country focused on international threats and domestic threats of terrorism, we cannot afford to lose sight of the threats that are closest to home, among them the threat of illicit drugs and the risks they pose to the young people of America. Now, more than ever, this media campaign is needed. Indeed, when teenagers were polled recently by MTV to gauge top issues in the minds of young people, drug abuse and the war/terrorism are the issues America's young are most worried about.

Stephen J. Pasierb, Partnership for a Drug-Free America  
Testimony to the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources  
March 27, 2003, Page 14 of 14

The NYADMC is not the sole solution to our drug problem. The process of changing social attitudes and behavior is often a slow, incremental one. It requires patience and persistence because right behind this generation of kids – the one we’re talking with today – is another generation of youngsters who will need to learn about the risks of marijuana and Ecstasy, methamphetamine and heroin, cocaine and crack, and whatever new drugs come our way. We, as a country, have a responsibility to offer these kids a solid education about drugs before they learn about these substances on their own.

With that, Mr. Chairman, let me say this: This campaign is needed. With changes already in place or underway, and a clear direction set by this subcommittee’s reauthorization, this campaign will have a greater impact. Each day in America, thousands of kids face choices about using drugs. Their choices are influenced by a variety of factors – parents, friends, siblings, peer group, pop culture and the media. That’s where the NYADMC comes into play: Media-based education campaigns – when managed and executed properly – have been effective in influencing decision-making and behavior.

Mr. Chairman, we will not find a more efficient way of reaching millions of kids with consistent and creative messages about the dangers of illicit drugs than through media-based education campaigns like the NYADMC. The current appropriation for this program requires less than one percent of the federal drug budget. As I said earlier, it amounts to less than \$8 per teen, per year in taxpayer dollars. It is a wise and honest investment that the vast majority of Americans support. And I believe, with the continued improvements and definitive reauthorizing language, the federal government’s investment in the NYADMC will prove to be the best investment ever made in a federally-funded prevention program.



Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much.

Mr. McConnaughey, we appreciate again you working with our schedule today, and we look forward to your testimony.

Mr. McCONNAUGHEY. Thank you, Chairman Souder; just on a personal note, when your staff called, there really was not much question as to whether I was going to appear here today; not for any reason other than my responsibility to both my company, to my client, the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy, to the U.S. Congress, and, of course, ultimately, the role that I personally feel I can contribute in this important cause. So I appreciate your recognizing my changing schedule.

Chairman Souder, Ranking Member Cummings, and distinguished members of the subcommittee, I am the project director of the ONDCP National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign at Ogilvy, the advertising services contractor for the program.

Just as background on Ogilvy, Ogilvy is the eighth largest global advertising network. We serve such well-known clients and brands as IBM, American Express, Kodak, Motorola, Hershey, among others.

As one of the world's largest and most respected advertising companies, Ogilvy's partner media company, Mindshare, is also one of the largest media planning and buying organizations in the world, ranking second with over \$20 billion in worldwide billings placement.

This gives us significant negotiating leverage, clout, if you will, which results in the lowest possible market rates and access to substantial and unique pro bono media match opportunities.

This has helped us achieve the unprecedented success in out-performing the congressional goal of the 100 percent media match donation value.

Importantly for the campaign, we are also a full service advertising contractor agency, known in the industry as a leader that understands how audiences consume, use and are impacted by media and advertising.

We have significant resources and in-house expertise, based on a breadth and depth of our broad client experience, working both in the private sector and in pro bono paradigms.

We unite diverse disciplines and partners, ensuring that the latest industry thinking and practices are brought to the campaign. This is vital in a dynamic marketplace, with changing trends, media consolidation and fragmentation, new consumer choices and new media and burgeoning clutter.

The job of understanding and reaching audiences today is more than just running traditional TV ads, although I do agree you must reach a threshold, as you have mentioned, Chairman Souder.

It could include Internet, cable television, which again, of course, is broadcast television; but perhaps school-based messaging or community communications. Even mobile text phone messaging today is affecting our kids.

With our marketing and media expertise, Ogilvy understands the strategies and tactics that help increase support behind the right core anti-drug messages.

Leading and managing a paid campaign is different from managing a pro bono effort. Doing both together, which is what ONDCP

requires be done, is a challenge that requires current and real market experience.

The role of the partners and the contractors is very well defined by ONDCP. Ogilvy is the primary full service advertising services contractor, a strategic advisor, one of quite a few to the campaign, and the coordinator for the media efforts.

Ogilvy recommends media strategies. We develop detailed plans from those media initiatives, negotiate and buy the media time and space. We do this for all the target audiences, meaning the general market, and specific multi-cultural audiences, which we do working with the specially knowledgeable subcontractors.

This media responsibility involves continuously evaluating, balancing, and negotiating with thousands of media outlets all the time, organizations, vehicles. We purchase in any given plan year over 1,300 different outlets.

Ogilvy negotiates, oversees, implements, and tracks the congressionally mandated pro bono match which, in effect, doubles our media stewardship responsibilities and, of course, increases the impact of the campaign, delivering more messages to our audiences.

Ogilvy has outperformed the goals on the media match by succeeding to negotiate and deliver more than the congressionally mandated 100 percent match every year of our contract. That has totaled nearly \$800 million in matched value, 107 percent of the goal, more than doubling the taxpayer value of the campaign.

Ogilvy directs all advertising strategy, research, development, and testing. Working closely with ONDCP and PDFA, we have established rigorous processes for the development and testing of all advertising. These processes parallel those of the most sophisticated private sector marketing programs, and help ensure that the creative work is more effective than what might be driven largely by opinions.

The strategic guidance afforded by the ongoing investment ONDCP makes in the independent research process, has generated a significant base of knowledge and data, which has aided in the development of what we believe is some of the best, most focused, and effective advertising to date, referenced both by Mr. Pasierb and Mr. Marston, I believe.

Ogilvy has led these processes with its depth of in-house and on-contract resources, working closely with all of the campaigns partners. These processes have been, over time, continuously improved and refined; most recently using the good guidance of the director.

Ogilvy also manages the Behavior Change Expert Panel, an independent advisory panel of experts with qualifications in advertising and marketing communications, behavior change, youth development, substance abuse issues, multi-cultural audiences, parenting skills, and public health.

The BCEP is an example of Ogilvy and the ONDCP improving on industry standards and exceeding private sector standards to enhance campaign learning through the use of independent advisors.

Ogilvy provides private sector best practice insights to the effort, working on the development stewardship of the ONDCP brand, ad flighting, and lead coordinating with campaign partners, and work

on valiative analysis are examples of some of the best practices activities that we deliver for the campaign.

We regularly develop advertising for the campaign on a pro bono basis, as well as for ad gaps, which Mr. Marston spoke about, and for inter-active banners. We also do the operational logistics components. There is quite a lot of that, that has to be done for the campaign.

Over the course of the campaign, Ogilvy or our multi-cultural subcontractors have served regularly as creative contributors to the campaign. In fact, in an account we recently did, we figured that we have produced approximately 29 percent of the traditional ads done for the campaign.

We have worked primarily within the PDFA process, but also, as Mr. Marston mentioned, we have provided other direct support, where the advertising could not be delivered through the traditional volunteer paradigm.

The circumstances have been for multi-cultural efforts, niche, or specialty audiences, or when dictated by the need to move quickly or with particular deep and direct involvement on ONDCP parts, as with the Drugs and Terror Initiative. We do develop all of the interactive banner advertising under contract with the campaign.

In conclusion, I would like to say that we know that the campaign is reaching its intended audiences and achieving breakthrough anti-drug awareness that has been referenced by Congressman Portman, by Mr. Marston, and Mr. Pasierb.

The anti-drug message, and particularly the new marijuana message, is being infused in the market and is becoming a verifiable part of youth vernacular and pop culture. In focus groups, kids repeatedly indicate that they see our ads all the time, and they are reporting positively on their belief that it is affecting them.

You have heard in previous testimony the good results reported by the Monitoring the Future study from the University of Michigan. We believe this is very good news and evidence the campaign is working as intended. Attitudes are changing and drug use by adolescents is declining.

The campaign has achieved significant campaign impact on parents. The purpose of the campaign is to prevent drug use before it starts and to motivate occasional youth users to stop and, of course, reduce drug use.

It is a hard, hard job, but this campaign is working, and the opportunity exists to drive the success forward and effectively sustain this kind of change in youth in what are, of course, future adults.

One of the hallmarks of the campaign has been ONDCP's continuous improvement approach, a quest to make the campaign better and stronger. As the campaign moves forward, it is important to recognize that it is better.

It is more focused than it was in 1998 when it started. With a strongly established grant, some of the best tested, most effective advertising ever on the air, and new guidance provided by the ONDCP Director, the campaign is a hard working tool for positive

change, making a difference in young people's lives.

Ogilvy is proud to be associated with the Media Campaign, and we have worked to help make the campaign better, stronger, and smarter. We look forward to continuing to do so. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. McConnaughey follows:]

**Testimony of David T. McConnaughey  
Account Director, Ogilvy and Mather  
Before the House Committee on Government Reform,  
Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and  
Human Resources**

**"ONDCP Reauthorization: National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign"**

**March 27, 2003**

**I. Introduction**

Chairman Souder, Ranking Member Cummings, and distinguished members of the Subcommittee, I am honored to be here today and welcome the opportunity to share insights with you and answer questions regarding the important task of re-authorizing the National Youth Anti Drug Media Campaign.

As context for discussing the Campaign I would like to briefly summarize my credentials and, more importantly, those of Ogilvy, New York, the company I represent, describing our role as contributor to the National Youth Anti Drug Media Campaign.

I am the Project Director on the ONDCP National Youth Anti Drug Media Campaign at Ogilvy – the advertising services contractor to the program. With more than 25 years experience in the advertising and marketing communications business, I have worked with, led teams and implemented advertising and integrated marketing communications campaigns for a diversity of products, services, organizations and causes: from Airlines to Zoological exhibitions, from corporate-image campaigns to franchise/retail sales events, from fundraising drives to membership initiatives. I have worked with both Fortune 500 companies and local/community organizations, communicating with youth and adults of every conceivable target audience description, age, ethnicity and interest. However, nothing I have been involved with in my working life has been as challenging, exciting, meaningful, fulfilling or important as working with ONDCP on the National Youth Anti Drug Media Campaign.

**II. Ogilvy Background**

Ogilvy is the 8th largest global advertising network, with 474 offices in over 120 countries, employing more than 2600 people in the U.S. and 11,000 worldwide. We serve such well-known clients and brands as IBM, American Express, Kodak, Motorola, and Hershey. Our core business is Advertising, Direct Marketing, Promotion and Interactive Marketing. As one of the largest and most respected advertising companies in the world, Ogilvy's partner media company, MindShare, is also one of the largest media planning and buying organizations in the world, ranking second with over \$20 billion in worldwide billings placement. We are the nation's second largest buyer of network television time, national radio time and local radio time. The company is also the largest

buyer of magazine ad space in the country<sup>1</sup>. Ogilvy's interactive company, OgilvyOne, is the largest purchaser of Internet advertising in the world. These factors give Ogilvy significant negotiating leverage, "clout," which results in the lowest possible market rates and access to substantial and unique pro bono media match opportunities. This has helped us achieve unprecedented success in outperforming on the challenge of delivering the Congressional goal of 100% media match donation value.

Importantly, for the National Youth Anti Drug Media Campaign, we are full-service advertising agency, known as an industry leader that understands how audiences consume, use and are impacted by media and advertising. We have significant resources and in-house expertise to draw upon, based on the breadth and depth of our broad client experience – both private sector and public service. We effectively unite diverse disciplines, and partners, within the marketing and communications mix insuring the latest industry thinking and practices are brought to the Campaign. This is vital in the dynamic, fluid, marketplace, with changing trends, media consolidation and fragmentation, new consumer choices, new media and burgeoning clutter. For example, today among both youth and parents, Internet usage now exceeds both newspaper and magazine use. More than 70% of teens use the Internet. They tell researchers that they use it to keep up on "what's cool" and to get information on subjects that are "hard to talk with other people about." Over 40% of parents say the Internet has improved the way they get health care information.

Our founder David Ogilvy once said, "You're not advertising to a standing army; you are advertising to a moving parade." Media and the youth drug environment are changing constantly. Our audiences are moving targets in a changing environment. 11,000 fresh, new kids enter our target audience cohort every day, as they grow and age and change from little kids to tweens to teens – and become more susceptible to illegal drugs. And as we know every day they are subjected to plenty of pro-drug messages, from the time they wake up and turn on their music, to the time they go to bed after watching a movie or surfing the net.

The job of reaching audiences today is more than just running traditional TV ads. It includes Internet, cable, school-based messaging, event presence, community communication, mobile phone text/e-messaging and more. With our marketing and media expertise, Ogilvy understands the strategies and tactics that help increase the support behind the right core anti-drug messages. The integrated media marketing approach to the Campaign is based on recognizing this goal and allocating resources across a range of media and communications tools to affect as many target audience members as possible – deeply, effectively and cost efficiently. Leading and managing a paid campaign is different from managing a pro bono effort. Doing both together, is a challenge that requires current, real market experience.

Ogilvy also has considerable experience in social marketing campaigns, having been responsible for the Federal Government's highly successful "America Responds to AIDS" campaign. For seven years we also have been the volunteer agency for the National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, and recently celebrated, with them, the

<sup>1</sup> (April 2002 Advertising Age Report)

first downturn in teen pregnancies in a generation. We are currently working with the Ad Council as the volunteer agency for Childhelp USA and do volunteer work with many other organizations such as Red Cross of Greater New York, National Eating Disorders Association and In God's Love We Deliver.

Ogilvy was initially appointed as the advertising contractor for the National Youth Anti Drug Media Campaign in January 1999 after an eight-month competitive review. Ogilvy was re-appointed in July 2002 after a rigorous ten-month competitive review. Our cost accounting procedures and systems are compliant with all federal requirements and have been recognized and approved by the Defense Contract Audit Agency, Department of the Navy and Department of the Interior (GovWorks).

### III. The Role of Ogilvy

The National Youth Anti Drug Media Campaign is an integrated public health communications effort<sup>2</sup> with the objective of helping educate and enable America's youth to stay drug free and reducing drug use. The role of the partners and contractor is well defined. Ogilvy is the primary, full-service advertising services contractor and a strategic advisor and coordinator for the Media Campaign.

- **Ogilvy recommends media strategies. We develop detailed plans for media initiatives and, negotiate and buy the media time and space.** We do this for all target audiences – meaning general market and specific multicultural audiences (working with especially knowledgeable subcontractors) – African American, Hispanic, American Indian, Asian American (including Chinese, Koreans and Vietnamese) and Pacific Islanders (Filipinos and Samoans), Alaskan Native and Aleuts. Culturally relevant messages are delivered in multiple languages including Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese, Korean, and Vietnamese. The Media Campaign also includes advertising in the U.S. Virgin Islands, American Samoa and Puerto Rico.

This media responsibility involves continuously evaluating, balancing and negotiating with thousands of media outlets, organizations and vehicles – we purchase over 1300 different outlets, placing the majority (87%) of the NYAMC advertising budget in media each year. That means over \$130 million going directly to the television networks, radio stations newspaper and magazine companies, internet providers and other outlets every year for paid advertising, the value of which is doubled by the pro bono match.

It is one of the largest sustained advertising efforts ever developed by the Federal Government with messages tailored for both general market and ethnic audiences.

<sup>2</sup> Integrated marketing communications is based on the researched and proven concept that a communication plan is more effective when it evaluates and strategically coordinates elements from a variety of communications disciplines in a clear, consistent and audience driven manner. ONDCP's effort encompasses a range of such disciplines such as traditional advertising and non-advertising communications elements including outreach activity with the entertainment industry, internet initiatives, partnerships with parent and youth serving organizations, corporate participation and media outreach.

Messages appear in general market and ethnically oriented broadcast and cable television, radio, newspapers, magazines, shopping mall and urban posters, Internet Web sites, in-school educational materials (e.g., Channel One), cinema/arcades and home videos. Many of the messages are distributed in multiple languages and use culturally appropriate advertising. The Campaign purchases advertising in over 500 hundred ethnic media outlets and uses multicultural subcontractors to plan and place advertising with minority-owned media outlets.

- **Ogilvy negotiates, oversees, implements and tracks the Congressionally mandated pro bono match**, which in effect doubles our media stewardship responsibilities and increases the media impact of the Campaign, by delivering more messages to our audiences. Ogilvy has outperformed the goals on the media match by succeeding to negotiate and deliver more than the Congressionally mandated 100% match every year of our contract – helping deliver a total of \$795 million in match value, 107 % of the goal, more than doubling taxpayer value of the Campaign

The pro-bono match has increased the amount of public service advertising and its visibility, supporting organizations that meet ONDCP established criteria and helping create an environment in which youth can grow up drug free. The match has helped assorted parent and youth serving organizations, expanding the Campaign's scope and reach in educating and enabling youth to reject illegal drugs. It has helped provide information and access to more resources to promote anti-drug education, healthy life choices, helping build community coalitions and promoting parental involvement and mentoring. Specific criteria are PSAs, which are directed at:

- Preventing drug abuse – including underage alcohol use,
- Supporting good parenting skills,
- Emphasizing nexus between drugs and crimes and violence,
- Emphasizing connection between substance use and HIV/Aids,
- Supporting other drug-related messages as determined by ONDCP
- Encouraging mentoring/after-school programs,
- Fostering self-esteem for youth,

Even in the face of significant budget reductions and media inflation, the pro bono match has allowed the Campaign to increase the visibility of anti-drug and substance abuse messaging in the Campaign. We have worked closely with the Ad Council, and ONDCP to provide more exposure today for core anti-drug messages produced specifically for the Campaign than ever before. Anti-drug ads developed for the Campaign by PDFA receive the most value in the match program. Over 80 major youth and parent-serving organizations also have benefited from the match (including National Fatherhood Initiative, Crime Prevention Council, NIDA, CSAP, CSAT, Big Brothers/Sisters, Boy & Girls Clubs, MADD, and 100 Black Men.).



- **Ogilvy directs all advertising strategy research, development and testing.**

Working closely with ONDCP and PDFA we have developed rigorous processes for the development and testing of all advertising. These processes parallel those of the most sophisticated private sector marketing programs and help ensure that the creative work is more effective than that driven largely by opinion. In fact, because of strategic guidance afforded by the on-going investment ONDCP makes in the research process, the Campaign has developed a significant base of knowledge and data, which has aided in the development of, what we believe is some of the best, most focused and effective advertising to date.

ONDCP has repeatedly indicated the importance of accountability for the Campaign. The processes of research, oversight and approval are a critical part of that accountability, so important to federal programs. It helps ensure the best expenditure of appropriated funds behind advertising that best practices indicate is more likely to work; achieving agreed strategic communications delivery. It is vital that these important advertising decisions can be based on data.

Ogilvy has led these processes, with its depth of in-house and on-contract resources. These processes have been continuously improved, refined and upgraded. The responsibilities include data gathering; strategy development; the testing of ad concepts with target audience members in the earliest stage of concept development; consultation with a range of experts as the ads are developed; quantitative testing of all finished TV commercials and on-going monitoring and tracking of that advertising in the marketplace.

In the Spring 2002, the copy testing component of the campaign was significantly strengthened as a result of direction of the Director ONDCP and the findings of a Task Force, made up of representatives from ONDCP, Ogilvy, PDFA and the BCEP. It was determined that revisions to the testing methodology were warranted to improve and strengthen the protocol. Among the notable revisions agreed to and implemented were:

- More rigorous action standard ("raising the bar") – In the past, commercials were allowed to air that merely maintained beliefs. The decision criteria were revised to be more stringent. Going forward, a campaign (or individual commercial) would not be allowed to air unless it significantly strengthen anti-drug beliefs and/or significantly weakens future intent to use drugs among the targets
- Test Every Ad – Historically, in an effort to contain costs, only one representative commercial from each campaign was quantitatively copy tested. Moving forward all TV commercials will be tested quantitatively before they air.
- Adjusted sample/target – The campaign target was broadened and refocused on 9th-10th graders (ages 14-16), while the tween target of 7th-8th graders was retained.

The following describes the core advertising research components.

Qualitative Strategic and Evaluation Research (FCEPS): This qualitative research focus group protocol is used for two purposes. First to develop and refine strategies to ensure effectiveness and credibility among our targets. Second to refine and enhance the creative product during creative development. It provides insight/input to advertising in the earliest stages. We include FCEPs for multicultural work in addition to general market advertising.

Quantitative Creative Evaluation (Copy Testing): This rigorous quantitative research protocol is undertaken to help evaluate finished creative concepts for all target audiences. It helps determine the effectiveness of the creative product for use in the Campaign to ensure that the Campaign's advertising communicates the intended messages and does not produce any unintended negative consequences. Commercials are exposed to test groups reflecting the ads target Parents or Youth (twens, teens). We ensure readable sub-samples of Caucasians, Hispanics, and African Americans. Respondents provide a measure of the commercial (rating, believability, main message) and ratings of anti-drug beliefs and intentions. The beliefs and intentions data from the test group are statistically compared to those from control groups (who do not see the commercial).

Advanced Tracking Study: This on-going study provides consistent, timely feedback on the effectiveness and efficiency of the campaign. This comprehensive research tool provides guidance for making tactical improvements to the Campaign, as well as uncovering strategic insights. It allows us to monitor the real-world performance of the Campaign and make tactical changes and improvements on an on-going basis (e.g., media weights, media mix, and flight lengths). On a weekly basis, we talk to 275 youth and 200 parents yielding an annual sample of close to 14,000 youth and 10,000 parents. The study also assesses the impact of the Campaign on awareness and attitudes, among both youth and adults. Specifically, the tracking research is intended to:

- Track awareness of and reaction to the Campaign efforts among a tweens (ages 11-13), teens (ages 14-18) and parents of teens and tweens
- Track the attitudes and beliefs about illegal drugs, and intention to use illegal drugs among tweens and teens
- Track the attitudes beliefs and knowledge about the relationship between parenting skills and youth drug use among parents of tweens and teens

The youth portion of the study relies on self-administered interviews using a touch-screen PC. The design calls for weekly quotas by gender within age and within ethnicity (including Caucasians, African Americans and Hispanics) for all youth groups. The parent portion of the study is conducted via telephone, with weekly quotas by ethnicity.

We also use a proprietary media modeling system that allows assessment of the relative impact of each media vehicle and message platform on awareness, beliefs and intentions, with input data obtained from the tracking study and other sources. The results of this system have been used to provide guidance, on which message platforms and ad executions are most effective, and which media vehicles, GRP/media weight levels and flighting patterns are optimal.

- **Ogilvy manages the Behavior Change Expert Panel (BCEP).** This independent advisory panel to the Campaign consists of experts, with qualifications in: advertising and other marketing communications, behavior change communication, youth development, substance abuse issues, multicultural audiences, parenting skills/typologies and public health.

The role of the BCEP is an example of Ogilvy and ONDCP improving on industry standards and, exceeding private sector rigor, to enhance Campaign learning. The BCEP has a significant depth and breadth of experience in effecting behavior change across a range of issues, including reducing youth alcohol, tobacco and drug use. A number of the BCEP members are in the field with parents and youth on a weekly basis, allowing us another source of immediate access to and information about the most current developments among our audiences. The BCEP's unique expertise provides non-traditional guidance to the campaign. This is refined knowledge that we use to give insight in the strategic development process, guiding and providing input for Behavioral and Creative Briefs, which are the "roadmaps" for ad development.

The BCEP has helped develop, improve and refine quantitative measurement methodologies/instruments/inputs, provided insight on campaign evaluation and national quantitative studies (i.e. MTF, NHSDA). They provided core insight into the refinement of the parents strategies which have proven very successful for the Campaign, identifying "parental monitoring," and recommending "modeling" of the parent behaviors, as the key approaches most likely to keep kids drug-free. They are a continuously available consultative resource. They have four to six regularly scheduled meetings per year, but have done far more by taking on the challenge of task force leadership and participation on key issues, as well as being ready for phone calls, emails, and regular "on-call" availability

- **Ogilvy provides private sector best practice insights and effort.** Development and stewardship of the ONDCP brand, ad flighting, lead coordination with Campaign partners and evaluative analyses are examples of best practices activity Ogilvy delivers for the Media Campaign. The following details branding development, as it relates to the Media Campaign.

The establishment of a product brand is a characteristic of effective private sector marketing and advertising and one for which Ogilvy is particularly well known. Branding is universally acknowledged as a way to ensure longer-term, sustainable success, and to multiply the impact of communications dollars.

Extensive ONDCP research provided insights on parent and youth attitudes towards drugs and helped shape creation of the parents' "The Anti-Drug" and youth "My Anti-Drug" brands, and still guides the brand deployment today. There are many reasons to have an effective "brand." For the Media Campaign, perhaps the most important is data from the ongoing tracking studies showing youth who are aware of our "brand" are nearly twice as likely to agree strongly with critical anti-drug beliefs. Clearly, the brand helps strengthen overall communication to youth.

Our brand actively engages parents and youth in the prevention message. Through various creative executions the parents brand positively delivers to parents the empowering message that it is their own actions that can make a difference in their child's life. The "My Anti-Drug" brand for youth, and the associated question "What's your Anti-Drug?" has caused kids across America to consider what in their own lives is important enough to keep them away from drugs. Recognition of the "Anti-Drug" brand among youth has reached over 80% and among parents, over 60% (NIDA/Westat). ONDCP Advanced Tracking shows advertising awareness for specific ad campaigns, such as the current anti-marijuana ads, at over 75%.

With nearly 80 volunteer advertising agencies and production companies creating ads for the Campaign, each with a distinct creative look, style, or "twist" it is the brand and its consistent strategic message that provides the critical underlying theme.

The brand also connects the Campaign's multiple advertising strategies, constituents and message channels creating synergy between advertising and non-advertising to increase marketplace impact. It is the success of the brand that has encouraged some of America's most respected companies – AT&T, Dole Foods, Borders Books, Safeway, Blockbuster, and many others to want to associate their own valuable brand names with the Campaign, in mutual efforts and co-branded anti-drug materials. This has been through the Campaign's Corporate Sponsorship effort, coordinated by the non-advertising contractor.

- **Ogilvy regularly develops advertising for the Campaign on a pro bono basis as well as for ad "gaps" and interactive banners, creates all ad rotations, prepares, manages and ships all ad material to media outlets.** Over the course of the Campaign, Ogilvy, or our multicultural subcontractors have served regularly as creative development contributors, producing 29% of the Campaign's ads. We have worked primarily within the PDFA process but have also provided direct support under circumstances where such work could not be delivered through the traditional volunteer paradigm. These circumstances have been for multicultural efforts, niche or specialty audiences (entertainment trade, children of substance abuser effort), or when dictated by the need to move quickly or with direct ONDCP guidance, as with the Drugs and Terror initiative. Ogilvy develops all interactive banner advertising under contract for the Campaign.

The agency also manages the logistical elements of the Campaign, providing the process functions needed for such large scale, complex marketing campaigns. The National Youth Anti Drug Media Campaign requires a significant level of tactical review, implementation and process management to fulfill the important production follow-up, legal clearances, substantiation maintenance, tagging and traffic functions.

## VI. Conclusion

The Campaign is reaching its intended audiences and achieving breakthrough anti-drug awareness. The 'anti-drug' message – particularly the new anti-marijuana message is being infused into the market and becoming a verifiable part of youth vernacular and pop-culture today. We garner 500,000 visitor sessions a month to the ONDCP youth website, Freevibe; many driven by our banner ads where we achieve "click through" rates two times the industry average. When they get to the site, they stay and visit with an interest rivaling other youth sites. We know we are reaching and engaging these kids in a medium they use and trust. We know Campaign advertising reaches about 90 percent of all teens 4 times per week (Nielsen 2002-03/X\*pert System and other independent syndicated research sources). In focus groups, youth repeatedly indicate that they see it "all the time," and report positively on their belief that it is affecting them. You have heard, in previous testimony, the good results reported by University of Michigan's Monitoring the Future Study. We believe this is very good news and evidence that the Media Campaign is working as intended – attitudes are changing and drug use by adolescents is declining.

The Campaign has achieved significant campaign impact on parents, reversing their eroding sense that they can do something about imminent danger their children face with respect to illicit drug use. NIDA/Westat data indicates stronger positive attitudes and behaviors regarding talking to kids about drugs, monitoring their kids to help protect them from drugs and their beliefs about monitoring. Particular progress was noted among fathers, a traditionally difficult target to affect.

The purpose of the National Youth Anti Drug Media Campaign is to prevent drug use before it starts and to motivate occasional youth users to stop using drugs. The campaign seeks to influence young people's attitudes and beliefs about drugs and prevailing social norms, key factors that influence decisions to use or not use illegal drugs. This is a hard job but the opportunity exists to drive this success forward and effectively sustain this change in youth and future adult drug use.

One of the hallmarks of the National Youth Anti Drug Media Campaign has been ONDCP and Ogilvy's continuous improvement approach, the quest to make it a better and stronger program. As the Campaign moves forward, it is important to recognize that it is a better, more focused effort than in 1998. With a strongly established brand, some of the best-tested, most effective advertising ever on air and the new guidance provided by the ONDCP Director, the Campaign is a hard-working tool for positive change, making a difference in young people's lives.

Ogilvy is proud to be associated with the long-standing, broad, and bipartisan supported Media Campaign. We have worked to help make the Campaign better, stronger and smarter. We work closely with ONDCP, PDFA, AD Council and other Media Campaign partners to ensure that we do our part to fulfill the Congressional intent of creating and implementing a successful public-health communications campaign that has measurable effects on illegal drug awareness, attitudes, and behavior. We look forward to continuing to do so. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. I would feel much more guilty about saying you have 8 minutes to summarize these complex things, if you did not spend your whole life spending 27 seconds to try to sell different things.

Ms. Conlon.

Ms. CONLON. Chairman Souder, Ranking Member Cummings, and distinguished members of the subcommittee, I am very grateful for your invitation to testify today about the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. I am here today in my role as the president and CEO of the Ad Council, but I bring with me my passion for the future of our Nation's youth.

I commend you for holding these hearings despite these difficult times. While I know our country's national security and our troops are first and foremost on your minds, your attendance is testament to an unwavering commitment to help keep our Nation's children drug free.

The nonprofit Ad Council has been a proud partner of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, or the campaign, since its inception in 1998. As the Nation's leading provider of PSAs, the Ad Council has over 60 years experience in correcting social problems through advertising.

The Ad Council's experience to date with the campaign has been exceptionally positive. As full partner, the Ad Council provides assistance to ONDCP in two important areas.

First, we develop and implement a PSA campaign that encourages the public's participation in community anti-drug coalitions. Since its launch in 2000, this PSA campaign has received over \$196 million in donated media. Second, the Ad Council facilitates the national Pro Bono Media Match Program. As you know, when ONDCP purchases time and space from media outlets for the core campaign, the media companies, in turn, provide a matching public service contribution. The purpose of the media match is to ensure that the paid campaign does not supplant current pro bono public service time donated by national and local broadcasting networks.

A portion of the media match inventory is divided among organizations whose programs support the ONDCP's youth drug prevention strategy. The requirement for participation is that an organization's PSA must address a scientifically proven drug prevention strategy, including after-school programs, mentors for at-risk youth, and toll-free help lines for kids in trouble.

Speaking on behalf of the 65 community groups that participate in the match, I commend Congress for recognizing that preventing youth drug use can only succeed with the full partnership of these grassroots organizations.

I have included a complete list of these groups in my written testimony. They include Big Brothers/Big Sisters, 100 Black Men, National Council on Alcohol and Drug Dependency, Boys and Girls Clubs of America, and Mothers Against Drunk Driving.

Let me clarify for the subcommittee exactly what percentage of the match these community groups enjoy. Up until last November, drug prevention PSAs other than the paid core ads accounted for 70 percent of the TV and radio match.

The remaining 30 percent of TV and radio, as well as 100 percent of newspaper, 100 percent of magazine, and 100 percent of outdoor

and nontraditional media match elements go to the campaign's core ads.

Although the community nonprofits comprise a relatively small piece of the overall match pie, they have received tremendous media exposure since they began to participate in the match program.

Consider the following successes for these organizations while they were participating in the match: The National Mentoring Partnership received over 200,000 calls from prospective mentors, resulting in over 40,000 new mentors for at-risk youth.

The National 4-H Council enlisted over 56,000 more youth in positive anti-drug behavior like volunteerism and community service.

Alanon and Alateen's English and Spanish language hotlines received a 200 percent increase in calls, which offer help to families and friends of substance abusers.

As you well know, in your congressional districts and in communities nationwide, these groups, one teenager at a time, are doing as much to prevent teen drug use as the Ad Council, ONDCP, and PDFA, combined. I assure you, they very much appreciate that Congress gives them their fair share of exposure through the campaign's media match program.

These grassroots organizations are ardent supporters of the media campaign, and we simply cannot expect to successfully reduce drug use without the critical local resources that they provide.

It is our belief that we can pour millions of dollars behind a single focused message that drug use is bad for kids. However, if at the same time we do not offer real tools and alternative activities in their own backyard, then our strategies will likely fail.

Frankly, it is analogous to a national advertising campaign that might successfully convince teens to wear Nike sneakers, and yet, they are not available for purchase at the local store. One could hardly expect a rise in sales.

As this subcommittee considers reauthorizing the campaign, I urge you to consider the impressive results of these 65 community organizations. I cannot over-emphasize how important it is that their PSA messages continue to be represented to the greatest extent possible in the match.

I would like to focus the remainder of my testimony on the tagging of PSAs that qualify for the match. This is a time-sensitive and critically important issue to the Ad Council and the participating non-profits.

In its November ruling, the FCC sided against the Ad Council and with the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws [NORML], and determined that Section 317 of the Communications Act requires that match PSAs be identified as "Paid for [or sponsored] by ONDCP."

The FCC ruling violates plain language of the Media Campaign Act, and creates a result that is misleading, confusing, and costly for the 65 nonprofit participating organizations.

Identifying ONDCP as the paying sponsor, rather than the nonprofits that independently produce and pay for these PSAs, is an incorrect labeling of the spots. ONDCP neither creates or exercises editorial control over their content, and the air time during which



these spots are broadcast is not paid; rather it is donated by the media, networks, or stations.

In addition, Ad Council research has uncovered a strong resistance by the public to volunteer for an organization, if they perceive it is drug-related.

For all of the aforementioned reasons, several nonprofits that provide key drug prevention support, such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters, the National Fatherhood Initiative, and the National Crime Prevention Council, have chosen to opt-out of the match, unless the FCC ruling is overturned.

As a result of the ruling, networks have refused to air spots without the "Paid for by ONDCP" tag. Unless corrected immediately, the ruling will result in fewer prevention PSAs from community organizations that are offering real solutions to America's youth.

On behalf of all the nonprofits in the match, we urge the subcommittee to correct this pressing matter, as you consider the reauthorization of ONDCP.

I have submitted specific legislative language in my written testimony, and we respectfully request the subcommittee to include this in your final bill.

In closing, I thank the distinguished members of the subcommittee for your leadership and commitment to help our Nation's children stay drug free.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Conlon follows:]

Testimony of

**PEGGY CONLON  
CEO OF THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL**

**Before the House Committee on Government Reform,  
Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources**

**Hearing on “ONDCP Reauthorization: The National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign”**

**B-373 Rayburn House Office Building  
March 27, 2003**

Chairman Souder, Ranking Member Cummings and distinguished members of the Subcommittee, I am very grateful for your invitation to testify today about the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.

I commend you for holding this hearing despite these difficult times. While I know our country’s national security and our troops are first and foremost on your minds, your attendance is testament to an unwavering commitment to help our nation's children stay drug-free.

The non-profit Ad Council has been a proud partner of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, or the “Campaign,” since its inception in 1998. As the nation’s leading provider of PSAs, the Ad Council has over 60-years of experience in correcting social problems through advertising.

The Ad Council's experience to date with the Campaign has been exceptionally positive. As full partner, the Ad Council provides assistance to ONDCP in two important areas.

First, we develop and implement a PSA campaign that encourages the public's participation in community anti-drug coalitions. Since its launch in 2000, the campaign has received over \$196 million in donated media.

Secondly, the Ad Council facilitates the national Pro-Bono Media Match program. As you know, when ONDCP purchases time and space from media outlets for the core campaign, the media companies in turn provide a matching public service contribution. The purpose of the Media Match is to ensure that the paid campaign does not "supplant current pro bono public service time donated by national and local broadcasting networks."

A portion of the Media Match inventory is divided among organizations whose programs support ONDCP's youth drug prevention strategy. The requirement for participation is that an organization's PSA must address a scientifically-proven drug-prevention strategy – including after-school programs, mentors for at-risk youth, and toll-free help lines for kids in trouble.

Testimony of

**PEGGY CONLON  
CEO OF THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL**

**Before the House Committee on Government Reform,  
Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources**

**Hearing on “ONDCP Reauthorization: The National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign”**

**B-373 Rayburn House Office Building  
March 27, 2003**

**Introduction**

Chairman Souder, Ranking Member Cummings and distinguished members of the Subcommittee, I am very grateful for your invitation to testify today about the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.

I commend you for holding this hearing despite these difficult times. While I know our country’s national security and our troops are first and foremost on your minds, your attendance is testament to an unwavering commitment to help our nation’s children stay drug-free.

The non-profit Ad Council has been a proud partner of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, or the “Campaign,” since its inception in 1998. At that time, Congress authorized ONDCP to “consult with media and drug experts, such as the Ad Council.”

As the nation’s leading provider of PSAs, the Ad Council has over 60-years of experience in correcting social problems through advertising. By marshalling the pro-bono services of top ad agencies and through generous donations of time and space from the media, the Ad Council has launched campaigns which are part of the American vernacular. Our iconic campaigns include “*Friends Don’t Let Friends Drive Drunk*”, Smokey Bear, “*A Mind Is A Terrible Thing To Waste*” and most recently, “*I am an American*.”

Each year, our campaigns receive over \$1.5 billion worth of donated media, ranking the Ad Council among the top ten advertisers in the United States.

**Success of the Media Match and Recommendations**

The Ad Council's experience to date with the Campaign - and with Director John Walters and ONDCP - has been exceptionally positive. As full partner, the Ad Council provides assistance to ONDCP in two important areas.

First, we develop and implement a PSA campaign that encourages the public's participation in community anti-drug coalitions and other drug prevention programs. Since we launched it in the fall of 2000, the campaign has received over \$196 million in donated media support. Importantly, its tag line "you get more when you get together" has helped to raise awareness about the different roles that individuals and groups can play in youth drug prevention through community coalitions across the country.

Secondly, we facilitate the national Pro-Bono Media Match program required by your authorization. As you know, when ONDCP purchases time and space from media outlets for the core campaign, the media companies provide a matching public service contribution. The purpose of the Media Match is to ensure that the paid campaign does not "supplant current pro bono public service time donated by national and local broadcasting networks." (Section 1802(b), Drug-Free Media Campaign Act). In other words, the intent is to preserve and supplement the traditional donated public service media model.

A portion of the Media Match inventory is divided among pre-approved organizations whose programs are consistent with and support ONDCP's youth drug prevention strategy. The requirement for participation is that the non-profit organizations provide public service messages that are based on scientifically-proven drug-prevention strategies like after-school programs, mentors for at-risk youth, and toll-free help lines for kids in trouble and parents looking for answers. These organizations are providing programs, information and resources at the

community level, and we believe that they are vital to the Campaign's ability to move the needle on preventing youth drug-use in America.

Speaking on behalf of the 65 community groups that participate in the Media Match, I commend Congress' vision and foresight in understanding that preventing youth drug use can only succeed with the full partnership of these grassroots organizations.

I have included a complete list of these organizations in my written testimony (please refer to Attachment 1). They include Big Brothers Big Sisters, 100 Black Men, National Council on Alcohol and Drug Dependency, Boys and Girls Club of America, and Mothers Against Drunk Driving.

Let me clarify for the Subcommittee exactly what percentage of the Match these community groups enjoy. Up until last November, drug-prevention PSAs other than the paid core ads, accounted for 70% of the TV and Radio match. The remaining 30% of the TV and Radio match, as well as 100% of newspaper, 100% of magazine, and 100% outdoor and non-traditional Media Match elements go to the Campaign's core ads.

Although the community non-profits comprise a relatively small piece of the overall Media Match pie, they have received tremendous media exposure since they began to participate in the Match program. That exposure has resulted in outstanding success. Consider the following:

- The *National Mentoring Partnership* received over 200,000 calls from prospective mentors - resulting in over 40,000 new mentors for at-risk youth.
- The *National 4H Council* enlisted 56,024 more youth in positive anti-drug behavior like volunteerism and community service.
- *Alanon/Alateen's* English and Spanish hotlines received a 200 % increase in calls to offer help to families and friends of substance abusers.
- *KidsPeace-Teen Central*, a website for troubled teens, received over 5 million visitors within a 3-month period.

As you well know in your own Congressional districts and communities nationwide, these groups - one teenager at a time - are doing as much to prevent teen drug use as the Ad Council, ONDCP, and Partnership for a Drug Free America. I assure you, they very much appreciate Congress giving them their fair share of exposure through the Campaign's Media Match program.

PSAs from these national non-profits have helped to connect youth with community resources and after-school activities, as well as promote effective programs that foster high self-esteem. In addition, more positive role models have been created for youth in new mentors, and in parents who are better informed about the critical role they play in keeping their kids off drugs.

These grassroots organizations are ardent supporters of the Media Campaign and we simply cannot expect to successfully reduce youth drug-use without the critical local resources that they provide. It is our belief that we can pour millions of dollars behind a single-focused message that drug use is bad for kids. However, if at the same time, we do not offer real tools and alternative activities in their own backyard – then our strategy will likely fail. Frankly, it is analogous to a national advertising campaign that successfully convinces teens to wear Nike sneakers, yet they are not available for purchase at local stores. One can hardly expect a rise in sales.

As this Subcommittee considers reauthorization of the Campaign, I urge you to consider the impressive results and the collective work of these 65 community organizations. I cannot overemphasize how important it is that their drug-prevention PSAs continue to be represented to the greatest extent possible in the Media Match.

**Tagging of certain PSAs that qualify for the Media Match Program**

I would now like to focus the remainder of my testimony on the tagging of PSAs that qualify for the Media Match. This is a time-sensitive and critically important issue to the Ad Council and the participating non-profit sponsors of the PSAs.

In its November 7, 2002 ruling, the FCC sided against the Ad Council and with the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws, or NORML, and determined that Section 317 of the Communications Act requires that match-PSAs be identified as “Paid for [or sponsored] by ONDCP.”

We certainly recognize the importance of Section 317 in protecting the public's right to know the source of material aimed at influencing the public. However, at the same time, the ruling violates plain language of the Media Campaign Act and creates a result that is misleading, confusing and costly for the 65 non-profit participating organizations which have been a lifeline of anti-drug support to communities nationwide.

**The ruling runs counter to a clear mandate of the Media Campaign.** As you know well, the Drug Free Media Campaign Act states that ONDCP funds are not to “supplant current pro bono public service time donated by national and local broadcasting networks” (21 U.S.C. § 1802), and that funds used by ONDCP in the campaign be matched by “an equal amount of **non-federal funds** (emphasis added) for the national media campaign” (21 U.S.C. § 1802(c)). Thus, identification of ONDCP as having “paid for” the match-PSAs is contrary to both the spirit and letter of the Media Campaign Act. Section 317 of the Communications Act cannot require identification of ONDCP as having paid for match-PSAs because the Media Campaign Act prohibits the use of Federal funds in placing the match-PSAs.

**The ruling will confuse, mislead and potentially turn-off the public.** Requiring that ONDCP be identified as the paying sponsor rather than the non-profits that independently produce and pay for the PSA is not only an incorrect labeling of the spots, but also demeans the work of the non-profits. Moreover, ONDCP neither creates nor exercises editorial control over content, and the airtime during which the spots are broadcast is donated by the stations or networks. In addition, the Ad Council conducted research for a campaign to recruit volunteers for community anti-drug coalitions, which uncovered a strong resistance by the public to volunteer for an organization once they learned that it was drug-related.

**The ruling financially affects all non-profits participating in the Match.** The Ad Council has estimated that the hard costs associated with the addition of an ONDCP tag for all PSAs that



currently qualify for the Match are potentially over \$10 million -- resulting from production and renegotiated talent costs (since it was interpreted that the ads are now running in paid space). These costs will need to be incurred by the non-profits, or ONDCP. In addition, a requirement that "sponsored by ONDCP" be placed on the PSAs will increase the difficulty non-profit Match organizations face in soliciting funds as organizations independent of government influence and funding. Some non-profits have expressed concern in their ability to attract volunteers, and the possible loss of donated media support outside of the Match, since the media companies are unlikely to support a campaign with donations if they perceive it to be a paid effort.

For all of the aforementioned reasons, several prominent national non-profit organizations that produce key drug-prevention messages such as Big Brothers Big Sisters, National Fatherhood Initiative, and the National Crime Prevention Council, have chosen to opt out of the Media Match unless the FCC ruling is overturned.

As a result of the FCC's ruling, networks have refused to air spots without the "Paid for by ONDCP" tag. Unless corrected immediately, the ruling will continue to have a chilling effect on the nation's war on drugs. It will result in more expensive and fewer prevention PSAs from community organizations that are offering real solutions and tools to America's youth.

On behalf of all of the non-profits in the Match, we urge the Subcommittee to correct this pressing matter as you consider the re-authorization of ONDCP. I have submitted specific legislative language in my written testimony that we respectfully ask the Subcommittee to include in your final bill (please refer to Attachment 2).

In closing, I thank the distinguished Members of the Subcommittee for your leadership and commitment to help our nation's children stay drug-free. We look forward to working with you, ONDCP and the Campaign partners to improve youth attitudes and behaviors towards drug use.

**Attachment 1:**

## Organizations in the Media Match

**Total: 65**

1. 100 Black Men
2. ACT Against Violence/American Psychological Association
3. Administration for Children and Families/Health and Human Services (Parental Responsibility)
4. Alanon/Alateen
5. American Symphony Orchestra League
6. America's Promise
7. Americorps
8. Big Brothers Big Sisters of America
9. Boys and Girls Club
10. Chris Farley Foundation
11. Center for Juvenile and Criminal Justice/Justice Policy Institute
12. Center for Substance Abuse Prevention/Health and Human Services
13. Center for Substance Abuse Treatment/Health and Human Services
14. Centers for Disease Control
15. Children Now/Kaiser Family Foundation (Talking with Kids about Tough Issues)
16. Citizenship Through Sports Alliance
17. Community Schools For Excellence
18. Connect for Kids (The Benton Foundation)
19. Country Music Association
20. C.S. MOTT Foundation/Afterschool Alliance
21. Education Excellence Partnership
22. Educational Testing Service
23. El Valor/Parents as First Teachers
24. Girls and Boys Town (formerly Boys Town)
25. Girl Scouts of the USA
26. Girls on the Move
27. Give a Kid a Hand/International Advertising Association
28. Healthy Start/HHS – Maternal and Child Health Bureau
29. The Healthy Competition Foundation
30. Hepatitis Foundation International
31. Horatio Alger Association
32. Kids Peace
33. Library of Congress
34. Mentoring USA
35. Mothers Against Drunk Driving
36. Musicians' Assistance Program
37. National Action Council of Minority Engineers
38. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
39. National Council on Alcohol and Drug Dependency
40. National Crime Prevention Council
41. National Fatherhood Initiative
42. National 4H Council
43. National Inhalant Prevention Coalition
44. National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism
45. National Institute on Drug Abuse
46. National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
47. National Mental Health Awareness Campaign
48. National Mentoring Partnership / Harvard Mentoring Project
49. National Organization on Fetal Alcohol Syndrome
50. Office Of National Drug Control Policy
51. Partners for Public Education
52. Partnership for a Drug-Free America
53. President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports
54. Points of Light Foundation
55. Prevent Child Abuse America/Merged with National Committee To Prevent Child Abuse
56. Recording Artists, Actors and Athletes Against Drunk Driving
57. Save the Children USA (Do Good. Mentor a Child.)
58. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration/Health and Human Services
59. The Reiner Foundation/Families and Work Institute (Early Childhood Development)
60. RI Dept. of Mental Health, Retardation and Hospitals/Division of Substance Abuse (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention)
61. U.S. Army/Operation Graduation
62. U.S. Department of Transportation/Drunk Driving Prevention
63. YMCA
64. Youth Build
65. YouthNOISE

**Attachment 2:**

Proposed Language Requested by the Ad Council to be included in ONDCP  
Reauthorization

"Section 317 of the Communications act notwithstanding, for purposes of facilitating the match PSA program, independently produced PSAs that qualify for credit under the match PSA program need not identify ONDCP as the sponsor of such match PSA where the independent producer of such announcement is otherwise properly identified."

Mr. SOUDER. I thank you all for your testimony. I first want to address the last point that you made, Ms. Conlon.

First, I think the ruling is absolutely stupid. I do not know how they could say it is paid for, when it is not paid for and the creative control was not there, and I assume we will address it in the bill.

I am a little disturbed by your statement about the research, and I would like to ask a little bit more about that. Are you saying that people do not want to volunteer for groups, if they think it is anti-drug?

Ms. CONLON. Yes, sir, and I will tell you where that research comes from. As I mentioned early in my testimony, we do a PSA campaign for ONDCP. The purpose of that campaign is to get community members to participate in coalitions. Those coalitions are very broad after-school mentoring, as you know.

When we probed about the concept of asking people to volunteer on behalf of kids, whether it is coaching a soccer team or being a tutor, they are open to that. But as we got further into the messaging and we mention drugs, they are recoiled by that, frankly.

Mr. SOUDER. This is really important, because you are, in effect, questioning the whole concept of whether or not anti-drug advertising works in our Community Coalitions Bill, because we put up ads and we run these things as anti-drug volunteers.

I do not want you to overstate what the study shows. So be careful in your choice of words, because we are on the record here.

What I want to know is, are you saying they are less enthusiastic if they find it is anti-drug, and they are more enthusiastic if they think they are helping the kids; or are you saying there is actually a resistance to volunteering, if they think one of the purposes is to reduce drug use?

Did the question say, you are going to be involved in reducing drug use? I am trying to figure out what the questioning was, because this is a challenge to what we do here.

Ms. CONLON. No, I understand, Mr. Chairman, and I would be happy to submit to you the actual verbatims from the focus groups. But this research was done about 2 years ago. I will give you, to the best of my recollection, what some of the themes were that came out of the focus groups.

There were comments made such as, "I do not feel I am an expert on drug prevention." When they hear drug use and keeping kids off drugs, they immediately leap to the fact that they are going to be dealing with people that are experimenting with drugs, as opposed to preventing drug use. That is why we, in our language, are very careful to phrase the request.

Mr. SOUDER. In other words, the resistance is not to the concept that it is an anti-drug group. It may be that they do not feel qualified as a volunteer then to participate in something that requires more expertise than playing basketball with the kids.

Ms. CONLON. Right, or they assume that when you say "drug prevention," they assume that there is an expectation that some of the people they will be interacting with are using drugs.

So as I said before, we are very careful when we look at that language, because they also do not want to put themselves or their families at risk. It is really creating the perception of, what is this about?

That is why the organizations that I have mentioned that, although they really appreciate participating in the match, they do not want to include that language at the end of their tagging.

Because you can talk about being a Big Brother/Big Sister, but then when you say, paid for by the Office of National Drug Control Policy, they are afraid that paints it with a different meaning than the broader, volunteering on behalf of at-risk children.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. McConnaughey, can I ask you a followup question to this? I know this is not a primary focus of it, but it relates to another question that we have talked about, as well as Mr. Pasierb. That is, the labeling of the actual ads as "paid for by the Office of National Drug Control Policy."

The groups opposed to us often say they are for a responsible drug policy. Do you believe that it hurt the effectiveness in reaching some kids in America in the at-risk population by the way we label our ads? Because would we not have some of the same rub-off problem in the ads when they see it come up at the end that it is paid for by the people who may send you to jail?

Mr. MCCONNAUGHEY. That is a very interesting question, Mr. Chairman. I think that what we found in our research as we developed the brand, and we worked closely with PDFA on this, is that quite frankly, when you say something that says, "brought to you from the Government," if you will, or "brought to you by the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy," it carries with it a certain authoritarian tone.

Many of the kids that we are talking to, they are not ready to hear a message that is brought to you by the principal of the school or whomever it might be. I think that it is very possible that you could get that kind of rub-off.

One of the advantages of the anti-drug brand that we call my anti-drug-free kids is that it takes that authoritarian tone off of it and allows the advertising to be much more approachable and understandable.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Pasierb, obviously, the Partnership for Drug Free America also includes the word "Drug" in its ad. It has a more positive connotation than Office of National Drug Control Policy, which I am not in favor of changing the office name. I am questioning what should be on the ad.

Do either of you know, in the FCC regulations, if it is paid for by that agency, are we allowed to put in the ad a different name of an organization that you could see where we could put the money through; or are we under a legal requirement that we have to say, "paid for by Office of Drug Control Policy"?

Mr. PASIERB. I am not really an expert on the FCC piece. I do know that when the Partnership was first started, one of the goals was to have no branding on our messages, not even the name of the organization.

At the time, our name was the Media Advertising Partnership for a Drug Free America, and the FCC actually required a name. That is why it was shortened to Partnership for a Drug Free America. But beyond that, I am really not an expert on the FCC individual requirements.

We are about to release a campaign which has a different name than ours. But we have found that as long as that is a codified organization, it can carry that name.

Right now, the media campaign messages carry the ONDCP in partnership name in what we call mouse-type. It is little, little tiny type that you can hardly read.

Mr. SOUDER. Yes, we tried to change that in political advertising. We have to have a box now around who is paid for, because that can be carried in political advertising to the other extreme. Mr. Bell.

Mr. BELL. It sure can. There are a lot of similarities there.

Thank you for your testimony. I will start with Mr. McConnaughey, because I am interested and I am certainly supportive of the campaign going forward. But as it goes forward, obviously we want to make sure the money is being spent properly, and you all have been at it long enough now and engaged in this war against drugs on television to take somewhat of a systematic approach toward it. Is that fair?

Mr. MCCONNAUGHEY. Yes, sir, there is a specific protocol, as we develop our media strategies and plans to identifying target audiences and the people that we are trying to reach in each of those groups.

Mr. BELL. Is that followed on every one of these ads? Mr. Pasierb, if you can followup on this, as well. When you were talking about efficacy of these campaigns so they will work, you conditioned them upon, if the ads are grounded on research and are properly tested beforehand.

I will start with Mr. McConnaughey, if you want to followup. Are all of the ads properly tested, in your opinion?

Mr. MCCONNAUGHEY. Yes, sir, we have worked very closely with the Partnership, with the behavior change expert panel, which brings a range of expertise in behavioral science, marketing and advertising, to develop a protocol for testing the advertising. As I mentioned, some of the very best advertising we have ever had on the air has come out of that process in the past year.

In my written testimony, there is a more detailed description of the protocols that we take our advertising through. If that is not adequate, I would certainly be happy to provide any further information to your staff.

Mr. PASIERB. I would certainly concur, the new system is more exhaustive; and as you heard in other testimony, rather than testing a representative sample, we are now testing each and every message. I think that is a level of quality assurance that this campaign needs to have.

Mr. BELL. The behavioral change that we refer to, I would think that's what makes the campaign perhaps the most difficult, because it is somewhat of a moving target, is it not?

Years back, it may have been cocaine that you were focused on. That goes to marijuana. That goes to finding out parents are not talking to their kids. So the target is constantly changing.

Mr. PASIERB. Absolutely, and behavioral change is the business we need to be in. So many times, campaigns like this were talking about raising awareness, and that is only the first step in the process.

We need to not only raise awareness through this campaign, but shape attitudes. We need to be measuring attitudes in the marketplace, to see if people's beliefs on these drugs change, and then relate that to a behavior change. It is really a three step process.

Whether that drug is marijuana or cocaine, there is a lot of evidence through the field, particularly the Monitoring the Future study, that has been done over a 25 year period. It shows that there are two really strong drivers of that; the first being perception of risk; the second being social disapproval. That is why the return to a larger percentage of the negative consequences messages in the campaign, we think, is the right step forward.

You heard Mr. Marston talk about the Leo Barnett campaign that was on the air and some of the new work. We think the work that is out there right now is doing those things.

Mr. BELL. How do you go about finding the focal point? I am a little bit confused about that. How is the decision made of, well, we need to start focusing on parents, because we believe parents are not talking to their kids about drug use?

Mr. PASIERB. In the Partnership for a Drug Free America, what we do and what we spend the majority of our time and dollars on is doing consumer research; finding out what the underlying attitudes are.

It is most important, and we got into this, this morning, in a session with Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. All that matters is the mind of 13 years olds. At one point, it really does not matter what we think.

We have to go out there and do the learning, in a very exhaustive way, and find out what is going on in the minds of 13 year olds, 14 year olds, 15 year olds, and 16 year olds, and then be able to play that back in a credible and persuasive manner through the advertising. So, if you will, you are also combining art and science here.

Through that same attitudinal research, we have learned very clearly that kids who learn a lot about the risk of drugs at home are half as likely to use. That is the primary argument to make certain that this campaign pays attention; and the parents, caregivers, or whoever that caregiving adult is in that child's life, and encourages them.

Right now, the thing that we are doing is monitoring; know what the who, what, where, why, and whens of that child's life.

Mr. BELL. Knowing how quickly things change with kids, and I assume it is not different with teenagers, as it is with my 7 year old. We started with Pokemon and now we are on to YuGiOh.

Mr. PASIERB. Pokemon is so over. [Laughter.]

Mr. BELL. I have noticed that, and the characters with YuGiOh are much more difficult. But that aside, how long does the data stay fresh?

Mr. PASIERB. That is one of the challenges of the Partnership; that we have to constantly be gathering the data, and we have to constantly be doing new advertising.

It is actually a frustration of ours that we do amazing campaigns that work so well, but we know after a specific period of time, we just have to retire them. That is because the target audience has

changed; the world has changed; the perception of the drug has changed.

That is one of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. That is to continue to do that learning, and continue to produce an ongoing flow of advertising. It is not like we can create one body of work and say, we are set and we are just going to run this for the next year. We do need new campaigns and we are constantly refreshing it.

We also have to be responsive to the campaign to what some of the rising drug trends are. Obviously, marijuana use makes up the majority of drug use. But there is also methamphetamine and Ecstasy and some other issues out there, that luckily we are getting a handle on in society, but we still have a long way to go.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, if you will indulge me, is that piece in place for the data?

Mr. PASIERB. The Partnership for a Drug Free America, through our campaigns and our ad time, we have made a conscious decision through working with ONDCP that we are going to direct our attention to those things. So the combination of the two is to get that done.

So organizationally, our primary focuses right now are on ecstasy and methamphetamine, and also some new campaigns that we are going to roll out on intervention.

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me followup with some particular questions. Mr. McConnaughey, you followed-up with some of the discussion here. You have talked about a more rigorous action standard of raising the bar. In going through your written testimony, and all of your written testimony will be inserted, as well, you talked about, to test every ad, adjusted samples. Mr. Marston talked about some of the pre-test and releasing some of that data.

I would like to hear how the inter-relationship works with the Partnership. If they develop an ad, who is doing the testing? Will that be through Ogilvy, Mr. McConnaughey?

Mr. MCCONNAUGHEY. Yes, we are managing the testing protocol. Members of the Partnership attend, in the case of the Early Development Group, the focus group sessions. Members of the Partnership and members of the volunteer agencies often attend those sessions.

Mr. SOUDER. And if there are adaptations to the ads that are required, how is that resolved?

Mr. MCCONNAUGHEY. That is usually communicated by the moderator, in the case of the FSEPS that we are referring to here. That is communicated by the moderator in a written report, reviewed by the representatives of our strategic planning and research group, along with strategic planning and research group at PDFA, who come to consensus on the findings.

That is communicated to ONDCP. ONDCP occasionally attends the FSEPS groups, also, and agreement is reached, because the creative process is a dynamic one. You want to take the data from those groups, for instance, and apply the judgment of the creative resources that the Partnership brings to bear on this. Because advertising requires a little art and science to resolve the changes



that may or may not be made to any given piece of advertising, before it moves forward.

Mr. SOUDER. As a practical matter, how does this work with your agency being directly paid by the Government, and the other being pro bono in the sense of Robert Wood and others funding and donating creative time? Can it be done in a timely fashion?

Mr. MCCONNAUGHEY. Can it be done in a timely fashion? If you mean, in terms of the research process, yes. I think that we work the research process as expeditiously as we can, given the fact that we have marketplace pressures to put advertising on the air at given times, because we have time slots purchased.

As Mr. Pasierb mentioned, we have to change and refresh advertising, and we seek to be as efficient and timely as possible. There occasionally is some slippage, from time to time, that has required that we step in or change a schedule to address the need to make sure that the advertising is right before we move forward with it.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Pasierb, could you talk about some of the changes that might have occurred in this and how you feel it is working, from the Partnership's standpoint? Director Walters is under clear mandates that he has to reduce drug use. He has re-focused, and you said in your statement you were comfortable with some of that re-focus.

We have talked with both your groups in New York, and I appreciate all the time you have spent. As we evolve, some of this has changed from longer term to more short term, very specific, and the director is looking for certain things. We have tightened the research standard. How does this work, from your perspective, with Ogilvy?

Mr. PASIERB. The research process is absolutely essential to any advertising campaign. The feedback that we get from the groups is processed and implemented in a fairly timely fashion.

In fact, the advertising agencies who were volunteering to the campaign, particularly the level of input from the target audience, is unequivocal. If we have learned this from the target audience, then we need to make a specific change in a message, and it is done right away. That is the kind of learning that any advertising agency, anybody working in the creative process, wants to assure their work.

Because as we have said, you do not just want it to be creatively excellent. You want it to be impactful and you want it to be effective. That is what the FSET process, as we call it, brings to the advertising, and those agencies and the people at the Partnership appreciate that kind of consumer insight.

At the end of the day, it is not what we think. It is not what Ogilvy thinks. It is not even, in some way, what ONDCP thinks. Again, it is that 14 year old, that 15 year old, that mom, that dad that we are trying to talk to, and we need to make absolutely certain we are touching them and moving them.

Mr. SOUDER. You mentioned a few minutes ago some of the campaigns you are working with. I know partial answers to this. But to what degree do you do your own research or idea development or creative development, and to what degree does it come from ONDCP and/or Ogilvy saying, this is what we are targeting; we

have “x” amount of dollars that we are focusing on in the Nation, and this is what we need?

Mr. PASIERB. The role that we play in the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign is to fulfill the creative product. The strategies in a lot of that is directed toward this.

We basically operate as an organization on two tracks: the campaigns in the Partnership for a Drug Free America that we do with our own process in the air time that we are able to get from the national media, as we always have; and then the work from the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.

Those are built on the message strategies of the campaign, and the goals of the campaign as delineated by the director. Our job is to make sure we create advertising that moves that target audience in the way that the strategy has outlined.

Mr. SOUDER. What percentage of what you do is related to the national ad campaign, and what is what you do independently?

Mr. PASIERB. Let me ask my colleague.

It is roughly half and half, at this point, I think, as we looked at it. We spend a considerable amount of time, and right now, for example, we are doing new campaigns for the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign that are essential to the balance of 2003 and early 2004.

We have made a conscious decision within the organization to put our priorities aside. That was something we did about 3 months ago to make certain that we could go out and find seven to nine new ad agencies to produce a large collection of campaigns.

Overall, through the history, it has been about 50/50. Maybe right now, it is more like 90/10. But that is what you have to do, to make sure that we are fulfilling the needs of ONDCP.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Marston used an interesting expression earlier. He said where there were not agencies basically, or they had the discretion at ONDCP, if they did not feel that alternatives were available, to go and seek other than Partnership support for the creative, and he mentioned a Native American agency. Have you seen this happen more?

Mr. PASIERB. Absolutely; there are cases, and the American Indian agency is a great example. There are very few players in that field. They are not of a significant size to be able to absorb the number of people and the financial burden of volunteering their time.

In those cases, on some of the multi-cultural pieces in particular, we do need to reach out to them in a different way and help for some of those funds.

Also, there is the development of the Internet advertising, the actual ad units that run on the Internet is a very labor-intensive process. In the Internet production advertising world, you do not have that same sense of volunteerism that you do in the mass media advertising world.

So while we see our role as creating the majority of the parent and youth-targeted advertising, those are two good examples, multi-cultural and Internet, where there does need to be that ability to reach out and do things in a different way.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you believe, other than those exceptions, that there have been some of the more mainstream things that you have

not had the opportunity to work with, and have you been working with Ogilvy to figure out how to balance those?

Mr. PASIERB. Absolutely, it is an ongoing process. There have been a number of components of the campaign that we have been involved in, the Drugs in Terrorism Campaign and others. Striking the balance of the flexibility to do those things is the issue at hand.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. McConnaughey, do you have any insights into this process? There is no question that this is one of the difficulties.

We have had very blunt discussions among both groups. This is a huge matter of debate in Congress, among yourselves, and in the office of ONDCP, of which this is merely a mild version right now; that the Director's goals of flexibility, which is the euphemism that everybody is using today, the ability to get fast, rapid response the way he wants it, and Ogilvy as a paid agency that does that, versus the willingness of the Partnership, which has been aggressive and is a commitment to try to be responsive to that.

How do you see this playing out, as far as how much we should micro-manage this in the bill, versus how much flexibility we should leave? I ask you both to comment on that.

Mr. MCCONNAUGHEY. Sir, I think the answer to that is that flexibility, using the euphemism, for the Director to guide the campaign to be responsive to the market place conditions if you will is, of course, very, very important. It is not our task to do the creative product for the campaign on an ongoing or large-scale basis.

The Partnership for a Drug Free America is a remarkable organization, bringing together the skills of many advertising agencies from around the country to create, as Steve just referred to, a large body of work.

Just recently, they put more work on the table to meet some very important immediate needs for ONDCP well into next year. There are some gaps in that work that they are working to fill, but some of our multi-cultural subcontractors are standing by, ready to do that if, in fact, we have some of these issues. As we said, sometimes these things are difficult to do in some of the niche areas, the multi-cultural areas, or some immediate demand areas.

I think that the opportunity is there for us to help, when we need to help. But the principle of the campaign, the way the campaign has been established, creates this very important public/private partnership that has never been done before.

It is hard, that process, but also the task that is before us is a difficult one. But I think that what we are beginning to see, the hard work is paying off. Yes, there are always some frictions and squabbling. But we know about debate, and I certainly do not have to tell any members of this committee about debate, because it is what you do every day.

But out of that sort of thesis antithesis, we come to come to a synthesis, and I think the fact is that some of the best advertising ever seen directed to parents and kids is on the table today; on the air today, if you will, and we have some terrific work in the pipeline coming forward.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Pasierb.

Mr. PASIERB. I would concur on that. In early December, when we were able to settle the 2003 media plan, it became very clear

that there was an enormous amount of work that needed to be produced in a very quick way.

We were able to go out and secure those agencies, get those agencies briefed, along with our friends at ONDCP; get out there, get them on board, get them briefed, get them turned around so that, I believe, it was 3 weeks ago, we were able to present that entire body of work to the Director, and get his input and his opinions and move forward on it. That was a very fast turnaround.

Doing advertising is certainly a unique process. If you do testing and you find out your advertising is not correct, you need to go back and you need to take the time to make sure it is correct. Speed is not all important; accuracy is, in this case.

So we have been able to meet the needs of the campaign. We feel we are going to be able to continue to meet the needs of the campaign. Mr. Bostock, our new chairman, has some strategies in terms of producing larger pods of advertising from each volunteer, to make sure that we build, essentially, a reservoir of advertising, should we need to access that reservoir for tactical needs of the campaign.

But in terms of producing advertising, speed probably is not the issue here, because the campaign has a process we need to go through; the FSEP testing, the review, the behavioral change expert panel. If those processes are applied to all the advertising, it is going to take a certain amount of time to work through the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign checks and balances that are in place.

So we view the flexibility issue, again, in those places where you simply cannot get someone to volunteer to do this work, or we do hit a place where there simply is not a sufficient number of volunteers and you have to fill a gap; if you need an ad for a specialty publication for coaches and it is a one little print add, it is very hard to go out and find somebody to go out and volunteer and turn that out right away. In that case, it might be easier for someone to just turn it around quickly. But those are the instances where we need to have that.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Bell, did you have a question?

[No response.]

Mr. SOUDER. Let me ask one other question of Mr. McConnaughey, because it is a very difficult subject that we have more than adequately, in general, debated. But now we are down to writing the bill, and there is the question of the past accounting problems.

We are still debating with the Senate as to language and how to work through this. I, as you know, have had deep problems, as we all did, with what happened, and at the same time, have not hammered on Ogilvy as hard as some, because those were kind of how the accounting world works. But somebody should have read the Government regulations before you did a Government contract.

I am assuming that, in general, Ogilvy has now figured out the difference in the contracting world for how you cross-bill. What is your opinion about if we include language that says, violations or anybody who has future violations loses the contract; and also, how we could better prepare if other agencies are involved in this process in the future, so that we do not have re-occurrences?

Mr. McCONNAUGHEY. Chairman Souder, I am not an expert on policy matters, nor am I an expert at all in Federal procurement.

What I can say is, I appreciate your consideration of me as a witness with regard to this matter. I know there are systems which regrettably were not up to the task when we first won this contract, and have now been found to be more than adequate, if you will, by the defense contract audit agency, one of the most rigorous of the Government accounting organizations.

We have an administrative agreement with the Department of the Navy and with the new Department of the Interior, which has taken over administration of the contract, which ensures that the integrity of the program will be maintained.

Based on my experience with that, there are protocols and processes to ensure that, and I think it certainly is the responsibility of future contractors to be sure that they do so. I know that ONDCP has committed to ensuring the integrity of the program, also.

Mr. SOUDER. If anyone from your firm wants to add additional material to your answer for the record, because there were statements made in the record today, and there have been in the past; and if Ogilvy wants to make any additional statements or any recommendations, we would strongly consider those. Because it is one of the main things being debated in the last few parts of where there is not necessarily agreement, both internally and between us and the Senate.

These are going to be hard decisions to figure out. It is very easy to demagog off past experience. What we are trying to figure out is, how best to address the most effective advertising that we can get in this country, because the issue is so difficult.

Are there any closing comments that anybody wants to make? We have covered a lot. We have some written questions that we will be sending each one of you, so we can build the record and get this in, in a timely fashion.

You have probably heard me say that we are looking for a mark-up in a few weeks. So when we get the questions, if you can respond relatively rapidly, so we can get them to the subcommittee members.

The full committee is likely to have at least one hearing, as well, and have some debate to try to engage further members. But hopefully, if we do our job right on the subcommittee, we will have at least clarified where the remaining differences are likely to be. Mr. Pasierb, did you have a comment?

Mr. PASIERB. You have our absolute commitment to all of that. Also, on the Appropriations side, our vice chairman, Mr. Rosenshein, will be testifying to Mr. Istook. We realize this is a two-part process of getting both the good reauthorization language and then the appropriators on our side to continue the campaign.

I would just echo what I said in my testimony. We have made a lot of improvements in this campaign over the last year. The Partnership finds itself at a point of significant strategic agreement with Director Walters on the changes he has made in this campaign, and we believe that this campaign can indeed prove what we have said all along, that anti-drug advertising does indeed work.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you all for your work, and thank you for your many years of dedication in all your organizations.

[Whereupon, at 4:35 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

[The prepared statement of Hon. C.A. Dutch Ruppertsberger and additional information submitted for the hearing record follow:]

Congressman C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger  
Committee on Government Reform  
Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and  
Human Resources  
Hearing on the ONDCP Reauthorization: The National  
Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign  
Questions  
03.27.03

1. I understand the purpose of the Media Campaign is to inform youth about the affects of using marijuana – but are these ads effective. I have a constituent that wrote me a letter regarding the campaign effectiveness.

*I would like to read a paragraph from his letter:  
“Does Mr. Walter’s really believe that it is possible to reduce marijuana use by trying to convince young people that pot is the main culprit in teen pregnancy, gun tragedies, auto accidents, and date rape? Would he expect teens to cringe in fear at the thought of inhaling four cigarettes’ worth of tar as they smoke a joint? Does he think viewers of the ads will believe that marijuana funds terrorism “a little bit”?”*

2. On June 19, 2002 a testimony was given by Dr. Hornik before the committee concerning the Campaigns effects on Youth. Stating “there is little or no favorable evidence to report – they were uncertain whether the Media Campaign had convinced youth to avoid marijuana use or change their ideas about marijuana.” What impact did the results mention have on the Campaign?

3. In authorizing the structure of the Campaign, Congress made it clear that ONDCP should develop an integrated comprehensive campaign - not merely an advertising effort. Have ONDCP met the goal outlined by Congress? Also, how did ONDCP accomplish its goal?

4. In previous testimony given by Mr. Walters, Director of ONDCP he stated “Marijuana use is the single most prevalent drug used by America’s youth” I would like know how prevalent is alcohol and cigarettes among

Americas' youth? And what have the campaign done to educate the youth about other forms of illegal drugs.



QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CHAIRMAN SOUDER  
“ONDCP REAUTHORIZATION: THE NATIONAL YOUTH ANTI-DRUG  
MEDIA CAMPAIGN”  
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY, AND  
HUMAN RESOURCES  
MARCH 27, 2003

**QUESTION:**

1. Resources: Could you summarize the relative proportion of resources that are put into the various phases of the Campaign? How much goes into traditional advertising versus multimedia, the multicultural advertising, and outreach?

**ANSWER:**

Over the life of the Campaign (1998-2003), ONDCP has obligated approximately 87% of its appropriation to advertising, 5% to other kinds of mass media (news media, entertainment industry outreach, and web sites), 4% to research and evaluation, 2% to clearinghouses to respond to public inquiries generated from campaign communications for drug information, and 2% to Campaign management and administration.

The vast majority of appropriations that are directed to the Campaign are directed toward advertising (87%) which consists of paid media time and space, production, research and testing, labor, fees, and the Ad Council. For the July '02 –July '03 advertising program year, of the 87% obligated to advertising, approximately 74% was directed to paid media time and space. Of the 74%, 64.8% was obligated to traditional advertising (TV, radio, and print), 6.5% was directed toward reaching multicultural audiences (traditional media specifically directed to the Campaign's core ethnic audiences), and 2.7% was obligated to internet advertising.

**QUESTION:**

2. Role of the Contractor: As discussed during the hearing and requested by Rep. Blackburn, could you provide a precise accounting of the proportion of the time and billings from Ogilvy and Mather which go to buying advertising time versus other activities related to the Campaign, as well as a specific breakdown of expenses for other services?

**ANSWER:**

ONDCP's advertising contractor plays several key roles in the Campaign. In addition to negotiating and buying paid time and space and the media match for the Campaign, the contractor provides strategic marketing and management guidance. It utilizes its best practice insights, manages the Campaign's advertising research strategy—including ad development and testing, manages the Behavior Change Expert Panel, and creates and executes advertising needs not fulfilled on a pro bono basis.

With respect to paid time and space, the advertising contractor, on behalf of ONDCP, buys media at or below industry/private sector rates. ONDCP does not pay any ad agency a commission rate on the price of media purchased (a 15% commission has been standard in the industry). Instead, the labor costs were determined as part of the federal procurement process. The request for proposals asked potential contractors to specify the costs for media buying services contemplated. The final terms of the contract set the amount of work to be performed and the estimated costs. This open process allowed the selection of the contractor offering the best value (cost of service provided). The proposal's contents are considered proprietary information. It would be inappropriate to submit it for the transcript of the proceedings. (Publishing the rates would vie competitors and advantage by enabling them to formulate proposals based on the published information). A briefing of members of the Subcommittee or their staff could be arranged.

**QUESTION:**

3. Testing and Evaluation: Can you explain what you expect the relationship to be between the process for testing individual ads initiated by Director Walters and overall program evaluation?

**ANSWER:**

Under the more rigorous testing standard instituted last May, all Campaign TV advertising will be tested before it is aired and will only be used if the ads have demonstrated capacity to move anti-drug beliefs and/or lower drug use intentions. This "higher bar" will ensure the Campaign does not waste scarce resources on ads that do not have the desired effect. This, in turn, will increase the likelihood of positive long-term Campaign results. The long-term results of this strategic shift should be seen in changes in youth attitudes, behaviors, and, ultimately, in drug use that can be detected by the overall program evaluation of the Campaign. Advertising developed under the new standard established by Director Walters first aired in October 2002. The impact of the new standard will be reflected in data collected between November 2002 and June 2003 and reported in December 2003.

**QUESTION:**

4. Cap on Costs: The Appropriations Committee has examined requiring a certain portion of Media Campaign spending to be directed entirely to the purchase of ad time. What is ONDCP's position on such a cap? What proportion of funding currently goes to ad buys?

**ANSWER:**

ONDCP feels strongly that the Director should have discretion to use funds appropriated for the Campaign as he sees fit. The success of the Campaign is ultimately the responsibility of the Director and this Office. This accountability for the Campaign's performance should be accompanied by the flexibility to use the funds as he sees fit. The Director of ONDCP, as a member of the President's Cabinet, needs the ability to act on changing data, emerging issues (new drug threats), and feedback from target audiences (testing and tracking). The Director must act on changes in the nation's drug control strategy and must also have the flexibility to determine what communications methods are best suited to address those issues and to which audiences. Mandating a percentage of the funds to be spent for the purchase of ads will take critically needed flexibility out of a dynamic situation.

Mandating a minimum amount of Campaign funds that must be directed to the purchase of ad time appears to be driven by the perception that the presence of Campaign ads has declined due to increased advertising costs, no budget increases, and our support for a multi-faceted integrated communications strategy. However, advertising will continue to be the primary strategic focus and will comprise the vast majority of expenditures in the Campaign. Over the last five years, advertising-related expenses have averaged 87%. Media weight (the amount of media purchased to attain the Campaign's exposure (90%) and frequency (4 x per week) goals) has remained relatively constant, despite inflation and reduced budgets, because ONDCP has used an increasing proportion of the required media match (85% in FY03) for Campaign ads.

ONDCP strongly believes that in addition to traditional advertising, the Campaign needs to respond to the emerging media consumption habits of target audiences. Use of the Internet, news media and TV programming and other media vehicles and strategies will continue to play integral roles in effectively reaching our target audiences. Every major marketing campaign - public or private sector - uses these techniques and strategies because that is what is recommended by the nation's most successful marketers. Over the life of the Campaign, these non-advertising communication activities have collectively averaged approximately 5%. However, each year these figures are subject to change depending on the media climate, issues, and other factors. Because we need the flexibility to use appropriated funds to respond to such concerns, we are against establishing a minimum that must be spent on advertising costs alone.

**QUESTION:**

5. Contract Irregularities: What steps has ONDCP taken to ensure that contract problems such as the billing irregularities reported regarding Ogilvy & Mather do not recur? Are you aware of any still-ongoing federal investigations regarding those particular irregularities? Would the Office support a provision disqualifying future contractors committing contract irregularities from re-bidding on the Media Campaign contract?

**ANSWER:**

The correction of past billing irregularities generally occurred immediately prior to and following Ogilvy's disclosure that its accounting system was not completely reliable. Ogilvy worked with the government to ensure the past problems were corrected. Ogilvy took remedial measures to fix its internal government accounting procedures. The Defense Contract Audit Agency has since certified Ogilvy's new accounting system and periodically conducts spot audits to check the system. Additionally, Ogilvy is self-compliant and periodically reports to the contract administrator. For example, Ogilvy instituted a new ethics program including the hiring of a permanent ethics official and provides ethics and timekeeping training to all of its employees.

ONDCP is not aware of any ongoing federal investigations regarding Ogilvy's billing irregularities.

ONDCP would not support a provision disqualifying future contractors who committed contract irregularities from re-bidding on the Media Campaign contracts since such a provision is inconsistent with the Federal Acquisition Regulation, would breach existing contracts, and entitle affected contractors to collect damages. Additionally, such a provision is arguably unconstitutional in violation of the prohibition on bills of attainder.

**QUESTION:**

6. Funding Reductions: How does ONDCP intend to compensate for the reduced appropriations in the program this year? What will be the impact of the reduction in funding? Do you anticipate that this would affect the availability of match advertising to outside organizations?

**ANSWER:**

The advertising plan for both FY03 and that portion of the FY 04 plan for which funds must be committed in FY03 have had to be significantly reduced in a number of key areas as a result of the reduced appropriation. We have compensated by allocating an increased percentage of the media match to core anti-drug advertising. As we use the media match to compensate for budget reductions and to maintain our communications goals, this strategy will reduce the available media match for outside organizations.

We also have eliminated or reduced media spending in local TV, local radio, and out-of-home in the March-June 2003 period. These budget reductions lowered the Campaign's reach and frequency against both our youth and parent target audiences. In the July-September 2003 period, we reduced activity in Channel One in-school television, national radio activity, magazine, as well as the elimination of the NFL multi-media program, and all local TV.

We have also delayed creative production and planned copy research for several commercials from PDFA, which we wanted to have available for the fourth quarter, but will now be put on hold and produced only if funding becomes available in FY 04.

**QUESTION:**

7. Audiences: What portion of the Campaign's efforts is directed toward general audiences versus targeted or so-called "niche" audiences? How many individual advertisements have been targeted at each audience?

**ANSWER:**

The Campaign's primary audiences are kids ages 9-18 (with a special focus on those ages 14-16) and their parents or other adults that play an important role in a young person's life (influencers). Audiences are reached through advertisements that have been developed to meet their particular needs. That is accomplished through general market ads (ads created to reach the public at large), ethnic ads (ads created to reach the various ethnic groups in the U.S.), and niche ads (ads created to reach a particular influencer group or to convey a particular message).

Over 99% of the Campaign's advertising budget has been directed toward reaching general audiences: pure general market (90.4%) and general multicultural audiences (8.8%). Less than 1% (0.8%) has been directed toward creating the "niche" ads for use in addressing the "influencers" category of our targeted audience groups. In the last two years, our advertising contractor has created 7 "niche" ads for entertainment and trade publications, 2 ads for the Campaign's workplace initiative, and 1 ad for children of alcoholics and substance abusers. In addition, four versions of one ad have been used to reach small, but critically important audiences, such as writers, teachers, doctors, and counselors.